

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

59

1

600

6945

MODERN
LANGUAGE NOTES.

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT,
MANAGING EDITOR.

JAMES W. BRIGHT, HANS C. G. VON JAGEMANN,
HENRY ALFRED TODD,
ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

VOLUME VII.

1892.

30301
11/11/93.

BALTIMORE: THE EDITORS.

PB

1

M6

v.7

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

Lodeman, A., George Sand's Metaphors and Similes.....	1-11
Sims, William Rice, The Happy Land: from the Phoenix.....	11-13
Karsten, Gustaf E., Indo-European <i>y</i> after Consonants.....	13-20
Cook, Albert S., Recent opinion concerning the Riddles of the Exeter Book.....	20-21
Cook, Albert S., New Texts of the Old English Lord's Prayer and Hymns.....	21-23
Chamberlain, A. F., Notes on the Canadian French Dialect of Granby.....	24-27
Scott, Fred N., The Russian Verb and its Accent.....	27-34
Logie, T., Ninth Annual Convention of the Modern Lang. Association of America.	65-72
Speranza, C. L., "A New Exegesis of Purgatorio xix, 51"	72-77
Schönfeld, Hermann, Die Kirchliche Satire und Religiöse Weltanschauung in Brant's 'Narrenschiff' und Erasmus' 'Narrenlob,' resp. in den 'Colloquia.' I.....	78-92
Matzke, John E., <i>i</i> in French <i>lieu</i> =Latin <i>locum</i>	129-137
Schönfeld, Hermann, Die Kirchliche Satire und Religiöse Weltanschauung in Brant's 'Narrenschiff' und Erasmus' 'Narrenlob,' resp. in den 'Colloquia.' (Schluss).....	137-149
Hempl, George, Initial <i>kn</i> in English.....	149-152
Mather, Frank Jewett, Jr., The Cynewulf Question from a Metrical Point of View.	193-213
Waitz, Hugo, Die Etymologie von <i>Pflegen</i>	213-223
Tolman, A. H., Shall and Will, and Should and Would.....	223-227
Oertel, Hanns, A German Poem of the xvi. Century	227-232
Schelling, Felix E., Three Unique Elizabethan Dramas.....	257-266
Browne, Wm. Hand, Notes on Morris and Skeat's 'Specimens of Early English'.	266-268
Cook, Albert S., A Literary Motive Common to Old, Middle and Modern English....	268-273
Logie, T., The Subjunctive Mood in the Patois of Cachy (<i>Somme</i>).....	273-276
Sims, William Rice, The Battle of Mallon....	275-286
Leser, Eugen, Old French Interpretation....	285-287
Oertel, Hanns, Hildebrand's Theory of Alliteration	287-291
Ross, Charles H., The Authority of "Gammer Gurton's Needle".....	321-334
Hewett, W. T., Notes to 'Hermann und Dorothea'.....	334-339
Davidson, Charles, Concerning English Mystery Plays.....	339-343
Karsten, Gustaf E., Etymologies.....	343-345
Schoenfeld, Hermann, Brant and Erasmus..	345
Pearce, J. W., Anglo-Saxon <i>Scar-heard</i>	385-387
Emerson, Oliver Farrar, English Pronunciation. The "Guide to Pronunciation" Again	388-392

Tallichet, H., Notes on Some Words used in the Sugar Industry, not in the Century Dictionary.....	393-394
Hempl, Geo., Old English <i>æa</i> =Germanic <i>æ</i> , and Old English Shortening before <i>h</i> + <i>cons</i>	394-395
Tallichet, H., The Etymology of Bayou.....	395-397
Jenkins, Thomas A., Note on a Paris Manuscript of <i>Guerino il Meschino</i>	397-398
Rennert, Hugo A., Some Documents in the Life of Christoval Suarez de Figueroa..	398-410
Otto, Hans, La Tradition d'Eginhard et Emma dans la poésie romanesca de la peninsule Hispanique.....	449-485
Elliott, A. Marshall, Lebrija and the Romance Future Tense.....	485-488
Leser, Eugene, On the Relation of Ben Jonson's 'Epicæne' to Molière's 'Médecin malgré lui' and 'Femmes savantes'....	489-495
Menger, L. Emil, E in tutti e tre, tutte e tre.	495-501

REVIEWS. ✓

New Webster (The) and the "Guide to Pronunciation." [O. F. Emerson].....	34-40
Grote, Wilhelm, Streifzüge Durch die mittlenglische Syntax. [Charles Flint McClumpha].....	40-43
Buchheim, C. A., Balladen und Romanzen. [A. Guyot Cameron].....	43-52
Bowen, B. L., Introduction to Modern Lyrics. [A. Guyot Cameron].....	
Super, O. B., Readings from French History. [Samuel Garner]	52-53
Soames, Laura, An Introduction to Phonetics. [C. H. Grandgent].....	92-97
Cloetta, Wilhelm, Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des mittelalters und der Renaissance. [F. M. Warren].....	97-102
Miller, Thomas, The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People. [J. W. Pearce]	102-108
White, Horatio Stevens, Selections from Heine's Poems. [Charles E. Fay].....	108-111
Körting, Gustav, Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch. [H. A. Todd].....	111-119
Genthe, Arnold, Deutsches Slang. [H. C. O. Huss].....	119-121
Béraneck, Jules, Sénèque et Hardy. [H. Schmidt-Wartenburg].....	121-122
Paris, Gaston, Extraits de la Chanson de Roland. [E. S. Sheldon].....	153-156
Thomas, Calvin, Hermann und Dorothea [H. C. G. Brandt].....	156-164
Hewett, W. T., Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea. [H. C. G. Brandt].....	
Lounsbury, Thomas R., Studies in Chaucer. [Charles Flint McClumpha].....	164-170
Flügel, Felix, A Universal German-English and English-German Dictionary. [Horatio S. White].....	171-175
Muret, Ed., Encyclopædic English-German and German-English Dictionary. [Horatio S. White].....	

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Restori, Antonlo, La Gesta del Cid. [H. A. Rennert].....	175-176	Weeks, Raymond, An Artificial Vowel-Rounder.....	56-58
Whitney, William Dwight, Introductory French Reader. [O. B. Super].....	177-178	Hausknecht, Emil, <i>Hutchels</i>	58-59
Logeman, H., L'Inscription Anglo-Saxonne du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix au Trésor de l'Eglise des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles. [Albert S. Cook].....	178-179	" " Schiller Translation.....	59
Von Der Gabelentz, Georg, Die Sprachwissenschaft. [H. Schmidt-Wartenberg]...	232-235	Zupitza, J., Chaucer's Prologue.....	59
Emerson, O. F., Criticism of "Guide to Pronunciation." [Samuel Porter].....	235-242	Mott, Lewis F., A Suggestion in Provençal Literature.....	59-60
Schröer, M. M. Arnold, Über Titus Andronicus. [H. A. Rennert] ...	242-245	Wilson, Charles Bundy, <i>Dove for Dived</i>	60
Schipper, J., The Poems of William Dunbar. [Francis B. Gummere].....	245-246	Hart, J. M., The Anglo-Saxon <i>glen, giena</i>	122-123
Rosselot, L'Abbé, La Méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des Transformations inconscientes du Language. [John E. Matzke].....	292-296	Harrison, James A., Negro-English.....	123
Koschwitz, M., La Phonétique expérimentale et la philologie Franco-Provençale. [John E. Matzke].....		"Tweedie, W. M., Kent's Cynewulf's "Elene".....	123-124
Bright, James W., An Anglo-Saxon Reader. [Francis B. Gummere].....	296-301	Hooper, C. Lauron, Trainstead.....	124-125
Squair, J., Sardou: 'La Perle Noire.' [Waller Deering].....	301-303	Super, Chas. W., Chick, Chicken, Chickens..	180-181
Squair, J., de Maister: 'Le Voyage autour de ma Chambre.' [Waller Deering]...		Thurber, C. H., Introductory French Reader.	181-182
Sohrauer, Max, Ueber <i>re</i> und <i>ré</i> im Französischen. [Thomas A. Jenkins].....	303-308	Warren, F. M., A Note on the History of the French Drama.....	182-183
Peyton's Glasse Of Time. [Henry E. Shepherd].....	348-352	Grandgent, C. H., Phonetic Section of the Mod. Lang. Association.....	183-184
Szamatólski, Siegfried, Ulrichs von Hutten Deutscher Schriften. [Max Blau].....	352-357	Davidson, Chas., The Play of the Weavers of Coventry.....	184-185
Skeat, Walter W., Principles of English Etymology. [E. S. Sheldon].....	411-424	Mather, Jr., Frank Jewett, A Note on the Soul and Body Legend.....	185-186
Hunt, Theodore W., Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. [Charles E. Hart].	424-428	Pearce, J. W., Concerning "Juliana".....	186
Jespersen, Otto, Studier over Engelske Kasus. [Daniel Kilham Dodge].....	428-431	Speranza, C. L., A New Exegesis of Purgatorio xix 56.....	186-189
Falkenheim, Hugo, Kuno Fischer und die litterahistorische Methode. [Gustav Gruener].....	431-437	Stockley, W. F., "G. T. S.".....	189
Larsson, Dr. Ludvig, Ördörrådet i de ärlsta isländska handskrifterna leksikaliskt och grammatiskt ordnat. [Daniel Kilham Dodge].....	437-439	Hempl, George, The Anglo-Saxon <i>glen(a), giel(a)</i>	246-249
Stedman, Edmund Clarence, The Nature and Elements of Poetry. [T. W. Hunt].....	501-505	Brown, E. M., Anglo-Saxon <i>glen, giena</i>	249-251
-Davis, J. F., Anglo-Saxon Chronicles from 800-1001. [R. B. Woodworth].....	357-368	Hempl, George, Anglo-Saxon <i>glen, giena</i>	251-252
Plummer, Charles, Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel (787-1001 A. D.). [R. B. Woodworth].....		Hubbard, F. G., Ruskin and Sharon Turner.	252-254
Wright, Joseph, A Primer of the Gothic Language. [H. Schmidt-Wartenberg]...	361-363	Friteau, Gustave, Artificial Vowel Rounder.	254
Celani, Enrico, Le Rime di Tullia d'Aragona Cortigiana del Secolo xvi. [H. A. Rennert].....	363-369	Hatfield, James T., Buchheim's 'Balladen und Romanzen'.....	254-255
Bernhardt, Wilhelm, Einführung in Goethes Meisterwerke. [Starr W. Cutting].....	370-372	Schelling, Felix E., Ben Jonson.....	255
Gollancz, Israël, Pearl: an English Poem. [Thomas P. Harrison].....	372-377	Hohlfeld, A. R., The Play of the Weavers of Coventry.....	306-310
		Brown, E. M., Anglo-Saxon Phonology.....	310-311
		Richardson, E. L., Further Notes to Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland'....	311-313
		Shepherd, Henry E., A Contested Point in the Interpretation of Tennyson's "In Memoriam".....	313-314
		Soames, Laura, Introduction to Phonetics...	314-315
		Grandgent, C. H., Introduction to Phonetics.	315
		Manning, Eugene W., Romance Languages..	316
		Tweedie, W. M., Popular Etymology.....	377
		Cameron, A. Guyot, Beekenes.....	439-442
		Lougee, Susan C., French Grammar.....	442-443
		Smith, Annie T., " ".....	443
		Cook, Albert S., Old English <i>Schurheard</i>	505-506
		Pearce, J. W., " " ".....	506-507
		Ott, J. H., Beacon, Beekenes.....	507
		Emerson, O. F., On a Passage in the Peterborough Chronicle.....	507-509
		Cook, Albert S., A recent Estimate of Ben Jonson.....	509-510
		CORRECTION.....	377
		BRIEF MENTION.	
		61-62, 125-126, 189-190, 255-256, 316-318, 377-380, 443-444, 510-512.	
		PERSONAL.	
		126, 190, 318, 380-382, 445-446.	
		OBITUARY.	
		382-384, 446.	
		JOURNAL NOTICES.	
		63-64, 127-128, 191-192, 319-320, 447-448.	
Hart, J. M., Judaism in Early English.....	53-56		

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, January, 1892.

GEORGE SAND'S METAPHORS AND SIMILES.

GEORGE SAND'S literary activity, it is well known, was almost entirely spontaneous. She was the "great *improvisatrice* of literature." She did not learn to write, but circumstances led her to the discovery that she could write easily, and she wrote very much as her mother, who was not strong in orthography, talked:

Pourtant elle parlait purement, comme les oiseaux qui chantent sans avoir appris à chanter.

The study of the figures of speech of such a writer is of greater interest than is the case with others who hunt painfully for their illustrations; it really amounts to a partial analysis of the writer's mind, because in such a case the similes and metaphors are truly the reflected images of the soul.

Comparisons between individuals of the same genus are not frequent in G. Sand, but the few we meet with are characteristic: Man, according to G. Sand, must be a voyageur courageux; il faut marcher sur un chemin aride et périlleux jusqu'au jour de la mort.

This sounds like Lamennais when he warns against the illusion that happiness is of this world:

Le bonheur n'est pas de la terre. . . Nous avons à remplir une fonction grande et sainte, mais qui nous oblige à un rude et perpétuel combat.

If men will not accept life as it is, or renounce it, les gens s'en moquent, says G. Sand, comme d'un saltimbanque maladroît qui hésite à crever le ballon.

But life's journey is not the same for all:

Le poète est fait pour s'égarer, son chemin, à lui c'est l'absence du chemin; while le savant marche lentement, mesurant chacun de ses pas.

Yet the scholar also is not destined to reach the goal, for la science est une route partant du connu pour se perdre dans l'inconnu.

Comparisons of certain individuals with those of another class are worthy of note,

because they show what our author regards as striking attributes of the latter:

Paresseux comme un cardinal; malin comme un page; franche comme une sauvage, etc.

Again, if she tells us that Catherine, the nurse, speaks of her service-tree comme ferait le gardien cicerone d'un monument splendide,

we know that she shares the peasant woman's love for nature; she would soon weary of marble statues, but never of flowers, plants, and the woods;¹ and she betrays her idea of an irresponsible passion, so generally a theme in her earlier novels, in such similes as this:

Mon cœur a été au-devant du sien comme un esclave qui se jetterait aux pieds de son maître, ou comme un enfant dans le sein de sa mère.

Similes from the Bible are extremely rare in G. Sand's writings; a catholic child, and the pupil of Mme Dupin de Francueil, she had not read the Bible much. Still, there are a few similes of this class, well-chosen as nearly all of hers are:

Quand on peut empêcher un forfait, c'est une lâcheté de s'en laver les mains comme Pilate.

And this one, referring to a child's doll which had been exposed to the rain:

Il me faut essuyer, réchauffer et caresser sa poupée comme un Moïse sauvé des eaux.

With classical literature she was more familiar; she had read the 'Iliad' and ancient mythologies at the age of eleven, so the gods and heroes lived early in her active mind, and men, women, and playmates would assume in her imagination the form of mythological beings. Such metaphors as *phaéton* or *automédon* for coachman, or *Dame Erèbe*, or *reine du Tartare*, or *sibylle*, for a negress, presented themselves naturally enough while her pen was going. Others; as,

le marquis chante comme Orphée; à dix ans il était beau comme Cupidon; Diane enfant [her young daughter Solange],—are not at all striking; rather more so are the following. She speaks of a great legislator as

¹ Flaubert employs the reverse of this simile, but not without irony: the *Suisse* in the cathedral of Rouen shows the monuments plus orgueilleux qu'un propriétaire campagnard vous montrant ses espaliers.

un grand agriculteur, une divinité bienfaisante (Bachus arrivant dans l'Inde, ou Cérés abordant en Sicile;

of Napoleon we read :

Comme Jupiter du haut de l'Olympe, il va remuer le monde avec le froncement de son sourcil;

and at another place he is spoken of as un fléau que le maître du monde repoussa du pied et jeta sur la terre comme Vulcain le boiteux pour y forger une arme inconnue.

Classification in natural history is

le fil d'Ariane dans le dédale de la nature.

On hearing Liszt play on the great organ in Freiburg, it seems to her that

les bruits de l'air sont tous entrés dans les jeux d'orgue, comme Eole et sa nombreuse lignée dans les outres d'Ulysse.

Things without life are comparatively of little interest to G. Sand; similes of which neither member belongs to some one of the spheres of nature² are, therefore, almost entirely wanting. A passionate interest in humanity and nature is, besides love, the main source of her inspiration. The numerous resemblances and analogies which G. Sand discovers between things human on the one hand, and external nature, especially animal and plant life, on the other, enable us to judge of her power of observation. Opinions are somewhat divided on this point. Henry James believes that she was not, in the deepest sense, observant. Brunetière says of Balzac and G. Sand :

"Ils se sont retirés en quelque manière de leur œuvre; et le vide qu'ils faisaient ainsi. . . ils l'ont comblé de l'observation et de la connaissance des autres."

E. Caro likewise thinks :

"On se tromperait fort en croyant qu'elle observât médiocrement la vie réelle et qu'elle ne s'en inspirât que rarement."

And G. Sand states of herself in younger years :

"J'étais déjà très-artiste sans le savoir, artiste dans ma spécialité, qui est l'observation des personnes et des choses . . . Malgré moi, je regardais et j'étudiais ces visages . . ."

This *malgré moi* is excellent: Does it not betray the unconsciousness of the true observer?

² Such as, les clochetons tous vernis du couvent ressemblent à des parapluies fermés.

We will divide the metaphors and similes pertaining to human life, the animal world, and nature, into three kinds, in accordance with the order in which the different notions are identified or compared, and give examples with few comments :

I. MAN—ANIMAL WORLD.

Of an increasing family :

Quand la ruche est trop pleine il faut essayer, chacun songe à emporter son miel.

A child is

vif comme un papillon, curieux comme un rouge-gorge;

or when feeble and dying :

un pauvre insecte qui se traîne lentement vers la mort.

The twins in 'La petite Fadette' are deux perdreaux sortant de l'œuf;

later on they are

fiers comme deux coqs; On les entendait babiller et chanter ensemble comme deux merles sur une branche;

one follows the other

comme un pigeon qui court après sa pigeonne sans s'embarrasser du chemin.

Birds are G. Sand's favorite creatures; she had a somewhat mysterious power over them and would study their ways with the keenest interest. This fondness shows itself in the frequent introduction of them in her figures of speech. A soldier returning to his family, wounded, is *une volatile éclopée*, while a nimble young soldier in gay uniform is *un oiseau-mouche*. A person lives in corrupt society *sans y laisser une plume de son aile*.

A young girl is

faite comme une petite caille et légère comme un petit pinson; une petite perdrix; maligne et curieuse comme un vrai linot; also jolie à voir comme un chevreau blanc.

A young peasant has

le corps élégant et souple comme celui d'un jeune cheval.

The bird, the horse, and the kid occur especially often in G. Sand's pages :

"Les animaux d'une belle structure sont des modèles de grâce. Qui apprend au cheval les grands airs de cygne, ses habitudes fières, ses mouvements larges et souples, et à l'oiseau ses indescriptibles gentilleses, et au jeune chevreau ses bonds et ses danses inimitables."³

³ Cf. 'Histoire de ma Vie,' vol. ii, p. 330.

The movements of animals are often used with good effect: a little boy carried off by his older sister

se démenait comme une anguille; elle gravit le plateau d'un bond pareil à celui d'un jeune chamois; hirondelle voyageuse, tu as été chercher en Afrique le printemps; le nageur s'élança dans le lac avec l'aisance d'un oiseau amphibie; il avait les bras souples comme le cou lustré des oiseaux de la mer; tu bondis sur moi comme un chevreau; j'allais m'ébattre dans la campagne comme un poulain échappé.

Neither has the domestic animal escaped her observing eye:

Un corps plus dur à la fatigue qu'un buffle—mon œil est dressé à la recherche [in botany] comme le chien à la chasse.

Now and then more ludicrous or repulsive pictures of animal life rise in her imagination:

Le curé bondissait comme une grenouille; la fadette en sautant comme une grenouille autour de lui; l'archevêque avait sa laideur toute crue et pas plus d'expression qu'une grenouille qui digère; un garçon qui a les yeux faits comme les bêtes qu'il mène; 4 si elle voulait jouer avec elle [a brutal schoolmistress with her little pupil] c'était comme un ours avec une sauterelle.

Vice, under an attractive exterior, is an insect immonde dans le calice d'une fleur embaumée—elle est trop familière, laissez-moi chasser cet oiseau importun.

Even for the emotions numerous analogies are found by G. Sand among the animals:

Je suis triste et amoureux comme le ramier; je leur [aux camarades d'enfance] donnais une poignée de main sans rougir et me troubler comme une dinde amoureuse; ton regard fut sauvage comme celui d'un chamois; elle [une femme sans cœur] est venue se repaître de la tristesse de son amie malade comme un corbeau qui attend le dernier soupir d'un mourant sur le champ de bataille; le ver de la vanité qui ronge le cœur; le silence de la crainte plane autour de nous comme un oiseau de nuit; mes songes dorés sont partis des cimes du Tyrol. Ils ont volé jusqu'à moi comme une troupe d'oiseaux voyageurs: beaux rêves de voyage et de solitude, colombes errantes qui avez rafraîchi mon front du battement de vos ailes; j'étais un oiseau des champs, et je me suis laissé mettre en cage... une liane voyageuse des grandes mers, et on m'a mis sous une cloche du jardin; une volonté aveugle, déréglée, qui courait comme un cheval sans frein et sans but à travers l'espace. L'idée... passa de la tête de la mère dans celle de Landry aussi aisément qu'une mouche dans une toile d'araignée.

4 She disliked swine, and was afraid of them.

Occasionally fabulous beings appear in the metaphors of our author:

Mes passions, ces dragons funestes qui essaient encore parfois d'enfoncer leurs griffes dans mon cœur—la poésie, ce cheval fantastique qui de son vol puissant sépare les nuées et embrasse les horizons.

Instances in which the first notion belongs to the lower (animal) order, and the second to the higher (human), form rare exceptions:

Les cris des oiseaux la suivaient comme une fanfare triomphale pour célébrer la marche d'une souveraine—une bande de ramiers qui traversait les airs et qui disparut comme une vision, avec la rapidité de la pensée.

An eagle hovering over a poor duck suggests

la mort planant sur la tête de ceux qu'on aime;

this seems extravagant, yet G. Sand was deeply affected by the destruction of animal life: in her childhood she would "sacrifice" to the deities of her imagination in a grotto, by *setting at liberty* birds and small animals caught by her playmates.

II. MAN—EXTERNAL NATURE.

A. Physical man:

Sa taille était élancée comme le palmier oriental; une petite nonne ronde et rosée comme une pomme d'api trop mûre qui commence à se rider; mes enfants poussent comme de petits champignons; robuste comme un cèdre des montagnes, fraîche comme une fleur des vallées; elle a le visage frais comme une rose de buissons; elle retomba sur son oreiller, pâle et penchée comme une rose blanche qui s'effeuille à la chaleur du jour.

A beautiful young girl without ancestry:

Pour être sortie d'une ronce, la fleur de l'égantier n'est par moins suave et moins charmante; le teint changeant comme le ciel d'automne; sa [du prêtre irlandais] grande voix, triste et pénétrante comme les vents qui soufflent dans sa patrie; l'œil vif et bleu comme le ciel de mai; vos yeux sont des étoiles fixes qui brillent pour briller, sans rien communiquer de leur feu et de leur chaleur aux regards des hommes.

B. Mental states:

L'âme humaine peut se renouveler comme une fleur.

Human happiness:

un lac uni et limpide, où il n'est pas tombé le plus petit grain de sable; notre joie est sinistre comme les derniers rayons du soleil qui perce les nues après la tempête.

Enthusiasm, etc.:

Fleuve débordé qui roule au hasard; une de ces excitations intérieures où l'âme longtemps engourdie semble gronder comme un torrent qui va rompre les glaces de l'hiver; quelque nuage de mélancholie vient encore à passer dans mon beau ciel; le chagrin, champ aride, domaine du silence; ma douleur est morne comme ces pics de glace que le soleil n'entame jamais; vos larmes tombent sur mon cœur et le renouvellent comme une rosée bienfaisante sur une plante prête à mourir; ma fureur s'apaise comme la mer quand le sirocco replie ses ailes; une âme irritée, sombre et avide, avec un caractère indolent, silencieux, calme comme l'eau de cette source qui n'a pas de plis à la surface, mais qu'un grain de sable bouleverse; le passé est un ruisseau qui se hâte de remplir le bassin où nous pourrions toujours nous désaltérer et où se noie le regret des jeunes années; les choses du passé grandissent dans le vague qui les enveloppe, comme le profil des montagnes dans le brume du crépuscule.

G. Sand, like Goethe, passed through a period of "storm and stress," and like him she saw in the turbulent stream the image of her own life: 5

Comme ce fleuve des montagnes tu es sorti de ta source plus pur et plus limpide que le cristal; effrayé du silence et de la solitude, tu t'es élancé sur une pente rapide, tu t'es précipité parmi des écueils terribles... De temps en temps, tu te calmais en te perdant dans un beau lac... mais bientôt, las d'être immobile, tu poursuivais ta course haletante parmi les rochers, tu luttais avec eux... Le torrent s'apaise et s'endormit. Mais son onde était encore longtemps troublée... Ainsi fut longtemps tourmentée et déchirée la vie nouvelle que tu venais essayer.⁶

—La Brenta arrache des débris de roches du sein des Alpes dans ses jours de colère.

III. EXTERNAL NATURE—MAN.

Similes of this kind, where the first notion belongs to external nature, the second to human life, show better than anything else "how faithful and close it is, this contact of G. Sand with country things, with the life of nature in its vast plenitude and pathos."⁷

"L'homme associé à la nature, la nature associée à l'homme, c'est une grande loi de l'art. Nul peintre ne l'a pratiquée avec un instinct plus délicat et plus sûr... Personne n'a su comme elle saisir, exprimer cette âme intérieure, cette âme secrète des choses qui

⁵ Cf. for example, 'Gesang der Geister ueber den Wassern,' and the last part of the scene in *Wald und Hoehle* in 'Faust.'

⁶ 'Lettre d'un Voyageur.'

⁷ Matthew Arnold, 'Mixed Essays' (N. Y. 1883) p. 248.

répand sur la face mystérieuse de la nature le charme de la vie."⁸

Among the most exquisite of all of G. Sand's similes is the following:

La plante fleurit sur la montagne à plusieurs lieues de moi... elle m'a laissé son exquise senteur... Le parfum, sans rien faire perdre à la plante, s'attache à la main d'un ami... Le parfum de l'âme, c'est le souvenir... il se détache pour embrasser un autre et le suivre partout.⁹

Heine, in 'Die Harzreise,' has the same thought: *Duëfte sind die Gefuehle der Pflanzen*, etc. The French edition of 'Die Harzreise' must have appeared about the time when G. Sand wrote her 'Lettres d'un V.' But in her 'Histoire de ma Vie' occurs, in a letter of her father, the sentence:

"La musique vous replonge dans les souvenirs. C'est comme les odeurs"; and in the same work she tells how her mother, showing her some bind-weed in bloom, said to her:

"Respire-les, cela sent le bon miel; et ne l'oublie pas."

There are a few other metaphors which seem at first sight like reminiscences from Heine:

L'herbier est un cimetière; la fleur cueillie est un cadavre qui perd son attitude, sa grâce, son milieu.

Heine writes:

"Da eine solche [abgebrochene Blume] doch eigentlich eine Leiche sei, und so eine gebrochene, zarte Blumenleiche ihr welkes Koepfchen recht traurig herabhängen lasse, wie ein todes Kind."

But in spite of these striking resemblances the *Entlehnungssucht* should not make us feel too sure; at all events, such figures are in perfect harmony with G. Sand's own feelings with respect to plant life. She tells us, for example, that, at the age of four, the couplet:

Nous n'irons plus au bois,
Les lauriers sont coupés,

cast her into a state of melancholy of which the mysterious impression lasted through life. How natural to her, then, must have been such figures as these:

Il y a, dans les forêts, des sanctuaires où l'on n'ose rien cueillir et rien fouler; le végétal

⁸ E. Caro, 'George Sand' (Paris, 1887) pp. 113, 107.

⁹ The full passage is found in the 'Lettres d'un Voyageur,' p. 22.

saigne et pleure de sa manière . . . il devient froid au toucher comme un cadavre. Son attitude est navrante; la plante dans l'herbier est rétablie par le souffle dans son attitude naturelle, si elle l'a perdue en tombant sur ce lit mortuaire.

At other times, plants in the herbarium are to her

des soldats passés en revue, avec leurs costumes variés, classés par régiments et bataillons.

But fresh flowers are

des princesses qui nous attirent, elles sont séduisantes; les fleurs de Venise ont une fraîcheur, une richesse de tissu et une langueur d'attitude qui les font ressembler aux femmes de ce climat, dont la beauté est éclatante et éphémère comme la leur.

How deeply G. Sand was imbued with this sense of analogy, or identity, between plant and animal life, appears best from such passages as this:

La plante est entrée, comme l'animal, dans l'économie sociale et domestique; elle prend ses habitudes de docilité, de servilité; les choux, les citrouilles ventruës, on les égorge et les mange. Les fleurs des serres ont consenti à vivre en captivité—elles paraissent fières de leur sort, vaines de nos hommages. Les indépendantes qui ne se plient pas à nos exigences sont les vrais et dignes enfants de la nature . . .

A few more examples of this class may be given without comment:

Une grotte sans eau vive est un corps sans âme; Les gouttes tombent une à une . . . comme les petites notes grêles d'un refrain qui s'éloigne.

Nature, when reduced to a dry, lifeless study, is

une pédante insupportable,
else,

une adorable maîtresse; l'horizon, cette patrie des âmes inquiètes; le rire du printemps sur la montagne me faisait l'effet d'une cruelle raillerie de la nature à mon impuissance; l'orage, cette grande convulsion d'une nature robuste qui bondit comme un taureau en fureur; la pierre est l'histoire hiéroglyphique du monde; chacune des palpitations des étoiles répond aux pulsations de notre cœur. Notre planète vit du scintillement des grands astres et nous vivons des mêmes effluves de chaleur et de lumière.

A star descending towards the icy peaks of the Alps:

Une larme de compassion et de miséricorde tombée du ciel sur la pauvre vallée.

Degrading comparisons are sometimes made by G. Sand between human beings and lifeless objects: distinguished persons, incapable of loving and of inspiring love, are

des momies qui ont des sentences écrites sur parchemin à la place du cœur; dans tous ces étuis de parchemin il y a des âmes bien lasses et bien flétries.

Or else, things may serve to describe special activities; a person serving as guide is *notre boussole*;

[Napoléon] dont Dieu s'est servi comme d'une massue pour nous donner une autre forme; il soufflait comme un soufflet de forge.

Also in a general sense:

J'étais un des rouages de ta vie; je suis comme une roue qui a perdu son balancier et qui tourne follement . . . ; j'étais un instrument dont il faisait vibrer toutes les cordes à son gré.

As a rule, only things of great beauty are thought worthy of illustrating human qualities:

La force, la beauté, le génie . . . les pierres précieuses de la couronne que Dieu t'avait mise au front, tu les jeta dans l'abîme; combien je prise ce diamant que je possède [a father speaks of his daughter] et autour duquel je souffle sans cesse pour en écarter le moindre grain de poussière; des yeux bleus comme des saphirs—le nageur avait la poitrine solide comme la proue d'un navire; la vie des enfants est un miroir magique, où les objets réels deviennent les vivantes images de leurs rêves; tu sortis de la main de Dieu fier et sans tache, comme une statue neuve sort de l'atelier et se dresse sur son piédestal dans une attitude orgueilleuse; notre joie est sombre comme la flamme de l'incendie.

We close this study with a small number of metaphors and similes involving musical, religious and supernatural notions, and revealing in no small degree the wealth of G. Sand's imagination:

Le violon pleure d'une voix triste . . . exhale les sanglots d'une joie convulsive; Les sons harmoniques de la harpe promettent aux âmes souffrantes sur la terre les consolations et les caresses des anges . . . ses cordes vibrent comme les palpitations du cœur; au son du cor chacun croit voir son premier amour.—Le hautbois lui adresse des paroles plus passionnées que celles de la colombe; les sons du chant n'arrivaient à mon oreille que comme l'adieu mystérieux d'un âme perdue dans l'espace;—le doute est le mal de notre âge . . . le précurseur de la santé morale, de la foi . . . le fils malade et fiévreux d'une puissante mère, la liberté—elle prendra son enfant rachitique dans ses bras; elle l'élèvera vers le ciel, vers la lumière, et il deviendra robuste et croyant

comme elle; le doute et le désespoir sont de grandes maladies que la race humaine doit subir pour accomplir son progrès religieux;— le choléra, ce vilain spectre, ce hideux monstre qui fait dresser les cheveux au genre humain— les bouleaux blancs semblaient une rangée de fantômes dans leurs suaires; les minces statuettes... semblaient des volées d'esprits mystérieux chargés de protéger le repos de cette muette cité [Venise]; les enfants sont beaux comme des petits anges; mes peines sont comme un noir cortège d'ombres en deuil.

One fact is worthy of note: figures of speech occur most frequently in those works of our author which were written under great emotional strain; in her novels of country life they are not frequent; the same is true of 'Les Lettres d'un Voyageur,' especially 'Les nouvelles L. d'un V.' and still more of 'L'Histoire de ma vie.' This circumstance does not solve the question as to the accuracy of the latter,¹⁰ but it throws some light on it.

A. LODEMAN.

Michigan State Normal School.

THE HAPPY LAND: FROM THE PHOENIX*

(ASCRIBED TO CYNEWULF.)

I have learned that there lieth, aloof to the eastward,
Far hence, and far-famous, the fairest of lands;
Yet but few of earth's folk may set foot on its surface—
God's might hath removed it from men's evil hands.
'Tis a beautiful plain, all embowered with blessings—
The fairest of fragrance that earth can afford—
All peerless the island, and princely its Maker
Who placed it there, proud, by the pow'r of his word.

There a magical strain of melodious music,
Unbarring the sky-door, floats down from above
To the ears of the blest ones there waiting to hear it—
A wide, winsome place, with its green woody grove.
Nor there at all may rain nor snow
Nor rough winds blow,
Nor frost-blown wreath,
Nor fire's fierce breath,
Nor hailstorm's beat,
Nor sunshine's heat,
Nor hoar-frost old,
Nor winter-cold,
Warm weather's power,
Nor wintry shower,

¹⁰ G. Sand herself wrote to Louis Ulbach: "Cette histoire est vraie."

*Translated from the Old-English.

Deal out devastation, destruction or death.
But the peaceful place lieth, all placid and happy,
The beautiful land with its flowers all blooming;
No mountains rise up amid it, as among us,
Nor do lofty cliffs lift themselves high up-looming,
Nor dene nor dale,
Nor caverned vale,
Nor rocky mounds,
Nor sloping grounds,

No roughness nor ruggedness rises on high;
But the fair, noble field, like the perfume of flowers,
Lies blooming with blisses beneath the broad sky.
And the wise men have told us, we read in their writings,

How that land, bright and happy, is higher by far,
Twelve measures or more, than our loftiest mountain
That lifts its high head under heaven's fair star.
Calm and gentle the plain, and its sunny groves glisten,
A joyous green forest—the fruits never fall,
But the trees stand attired in perpetual brightness,
Just as God, in his goodness, commanded them all.
In the winter and summer, the woods wear their foliage,

Not a leaf in the zephyr shall ever decay,
Nor the sun, with its heat, ever scathe it and blight it,
Till the world shall itself in the end pass away.
Just as when, long ago, the great gulf of the waters,
The sea-flood, encompassed the earth in its clasp,
The good plain stood at all points secure and protected,
Undeified, (by God's grace,) 'gainst the waves' greedy grasp;

So still it shall stand, with its verdure still blooming,
Till the coming of fire, the Judgment of God,
When the house of the dead shall at last be uncovered,
And the tombs of all men be upturned from their sod.

In that country, no fierce persecutor nor foe,
No weeping, nor wailing, nor token of woe,
Old age with its weakness, nor poverty's want,
Nor death with its grimness, so cruel and gaunt,

Nor loss of life,
Nor sin nor strife,
Misfortune's lot
There cometh not,
Nor cruel wrack,
Nor wealth's sad lack,

Neither sorrow nor sleeping, nor troublesome sickness,
Nor sharp change of weather, nor winter's wild storm,

Breaking fierce neath the heavens, doth hurt any creature,

Nor the hard frost's cold icicles bring any one harm.
There no hail-storms can beat on the earth's stricken bosom,

Cloudy tempests of wind, water whirled in the air—

Spring forth streams, the most wondrously splendid of fountains,

And water the earth with their wavelets so fair;
The most winsome of floods, from the midst of the woodland,

Break forth, ocean-cold, every month of the year,
And play, in bright flashes, through plain and through forest;

For twelve times, according to God's own command,
They must play o'er the ground of that glorious land,
All joyous and sparkling and clear.

There the trees droop with foliage and bright-flashing fruitage,

Sacred leaves of the forest that never can fade;
Never fall on the fold of the earth fallow blossoms,
The beauty of trees with their wide-spreading shade;

On the trees the full branches are burdened always,

And the fruit is renewed at all seasons and days.
In the green grassy plain, stand the green flashing forests,

The brightest of woodlands, adorned by God's might;

And that beautiful brightness shall never be broken,
Where the perfume so sweet fills the land with delight.

Forever and ever, this ever-green forest

No changes of fragrance or hue shall attend,
Till he who created it in the beginning

Shall bring all the old works of yore to an end.

WILLIAM RICE SIMS.

University of Mississippi.

INDO-EUROPEAN *u* AFTER CONSONANTS

and the relation of roots *stū*, *plū*, *dū*, etc., to *stō*, *plō*, *dō*.

THERE exist unmistakable relations between some I.-E. roots belonging to the *eu*-series and others which move within the *ē*, *ō* or the *ē*, *ō* series; yet the nature of these relations has been so far an unsolved problem. We have, for instance, such roots as *pleu* and *plō*, the first represented in Germanic by Anglo-Saxon *fleotan*, O.H.G. *fliozzan*, etc., in Greek by *πλέω*, *πλόος*, *πλύνω*, etc.; in Latin by *pluere*; in Sanskrit by *plavate*, *plava*, *pluti*, etc.; the second by Gothic *flodus*, perhaps **fleps*, Anglo-Saxon *flōwan*, *flōdu*, O. N. *flōa*, etc., by Greek *πλώω*, *πλωτήρ*, *πλωτός*. Other instances are: roots *steu*: *stē*, *stō*=German *Stande* (I.-E. *stūtā*); English *stud* (I.-E. *stūtō*); Greek *στέα*, *στέλος*; Sanskrit *sthū-rā*: Ger-

manic *standan*, *stō-la stō-ra* (Old Norse *stórr*); Greek *ἵστημι*; Sanskrit *tishthāmi*, etc.;—roots *greu*(*gru*): *grē*(*gr*)=O.H.G. *krōn* (I.-E. *grouno*); Greek *γρῦζω*: Germanic *krā(j)an*, O.H.G. *chramuh*, etc. Greek *γέφανος*;—roots *streu*: *strō*(*str*)=German *stroh* (I.-E. *strogo*); Gothic *straujan*: Latin *sterno*, Greek *στρώννυμι*; Sanskrit *strnomi*; roots *snū*: *snē*=Greek *νέω*: *νήχω*. Roots *sku*: *ska*=German *Scheuer* (Germanic *skeu(r)ō*) O.N. *skuggi* (Germanic *skuyan*) Latin *scutum*, *obscurus*, etc.: Germanic *ska-mō*, *ska-du*, etc. These examples may suffice; they might easily be multiplied, and it is largely a question of discretion how far one should go in identifying such parallel forms. We limit ourselves to safe working material and use only such roots as are both in meaning and in form so similar that they naturally seem to belong in the same category. Indeed they have been clasped together by most writers, and where they have been kept apart, it was only on account of the one difficulty which I intend to treat here. The question is, How can we reconcile the I.-E. vowel series *ēu*, *ōu*, *ū* (*hū*) *h* (*u*) with *ō*, *ē*, *ā*, or even with the *ē*, *ō*-series? One solution of the problem has been suggested by Schulze¹; according to him, the consonantal *u* was dropped after *ō*, *ē* in forms like I.-E. **plōy-tu* (Gothic *flodus*). This has been accepted by Bremer, among others, in his essay on Germanic *ē*²; yet it may be said that Bremer only touches upon this question as a side issue, and in the main Schulze's idea has not met with recognition by philologists. Indeed, it leaves so many difficulties unexplained, besides necessitating a rather extensive sweep of analogy, that we feel justified in looking for another explanation.

It may be well first to correct a few inaccuracies which, in looking over the literature concerned with this subject, I find in G. Meyer's 'Greek Grammar.' On page 65 it is stated that the Greek *ω*, treated in § 56, is *e* in Gothic, *ā* in O.H.G. The sentence should read, Gothic *o*, O.H.G. *uo*.—On page 66, the author says:

"Wz. γινω erkennen, durch Metathese oder suffixales *ō* entstanden, daher mit durchgehendem *ω*."

¹ Kuhn's *Zs.*, xxvii.

² Paul und Braune: *Beiträge*, xi.

The morphological genesis of $\gamma r \omega$ offers no reason why it should have ω exclusively. There is no difference in formation between this $\gamma r \omega$ and $gn\bar{e}$, $gn\bar{o}$ treated in § 35; besides, we actually have forms of the root $\gamma r \omega$ ('erkennen') with \bar{a} in the Latin *gnarus*, and with \bar{e} in Anglo-Saxon *cnāwan*, O.H.G. *chnāan*.—On page 171, Meyer puts Gothic *flodu-* under root *pleu*; it should come under *plō*, if the distinction is kept up at all.

Returning now to our problem we start with the fact, that in Indo-European many roots in \bar{e} , \bar{o} have been formed from the weakest phase of other roots, with the suffix \bar{e} , \bar{o} \bar{a} .³ The frequency of this phenomenon will justify us in advancing the theory, that *plē*, *plō* came from *ply-ē*, *ply-ō*, if we can make it probable that consonant *u* would drop in forms like *plyē*, *strē*, *stryē*. The fact must first be emphasized that there are double consonants at the beginning of all these roots. We will then see that nothing militates against our theory, while some phenomena in I.-E. strongly point to it.

The weakest phase of the *eu*-series appears before vowels as consonant *u*; cf. Gothic *vasjan*, *vans*. Now there is no instance of this *u* after double consonants in I.-E., but there the *ūu*-form has been generalized.⁴ Does not this, together with *gen*.—: $\gamma r + \omega$: $\gamma r \omega$ suggest, that we actually possess this weakest form of *pleu* hidden in *plō* from *ply-ō*? Another point of circumstantial evidence in our favor we find in the parallel fate of consonant *i* in I.-E. According to Osthoff, the latter was dropped after consonants, when the following syllable began with \bar{i} .

"Das einen consonanten behaftende \bar{i} fiel weg, wenn die nächst folgende silbe mit \bar{i} anlautete."⁵

Whether the consonantal *u* was subject to similar dissimilating influences, I will not discuss here, but we find that its history depends upon the character of the preceding consonants. Drawing my conclusions only from such I.-E. formations as must be directly constructed from existing materials, I may say

³ Cf. Brugmann 'M.U.' i; Bremer, *Beiträge*, xi; Whitney, 'Sanskrit Grammar,' p. 36; Osthoff, 'M. U.', iv, p. 366.

⁴ Cf. Brugmann, 'Grundriss' i, pp. 140 and 254.

⁵ Cf. Osthoff, 'M. U.' iv, 19.

that two consonants + \bar{u} could not exist in I.-E. Considering, then, J. Schmidt's **qtur-tos*: *quartus* and examining the consonants of the roots here treated, I will eliminate the combination mute + mute and say that *u*-consonant was dropped after consonantal groups which contained a sonorous consonant or *s*. For these groups whose particular phonetic character insures for them a special chapter in the history of consonants in other languages,⁶ it appears natural that their history here should differ from that of mute + mute. The *s* seems to give a special energy and force of resistance to a following mute,⁷ so that a form *stūē* may well have kept its *t*, while *qtur-tos* lost it; and, on the other hand, the liquids and nasals are everywhere protected by their own character as sonorous sounds, and especially as last elements of consonantal diphthongs.

We have seen, how, from an *eu*-series we may arrive at \bar{o} , \bar{e} , \bar{a} , \bar{a} ; the latter alternates with \bar{e} , \bar{o} , \bar{a} , zero, and thus we get the \bar{z} , $\bar{\delta}$ in *ster*, *στρον*, not by any process of metathesis, but by a secondary completion of a favorite series: *strē*, *strō* suggested a *str* and this, in some sections, a *ster*, *stor*. Besides, we must not, of course, suppose that the process of composition and contraction was limited to \bar{e} , \bar{o} , \bar{a} , \bar{a} of verbal stems, for before the ready-made nominal suffixes beginning with a vowel, the \bar{u} was also dropped, and the resulting forms, made up from roots in *eu*, helped to form new centers, from which *u*-less roots would spring. Thus, for instance, we need not regard the Gothic *flodus*=I.-E., *plōtus*, or probably better *plātus*, and Germanic **fleðis*, Gothic **fleps*, etc.,=I.-E. *plitis* (in German *Unflath* and in about a dozen old Teutonic proper names) as being formed from verbal roots *plō*, *plē*; they may as well be derived from *ply*+suffix *ātu*-, *iti*-, and *plātu*-, *pliti*- could then, in their turn, be understood by the *sprachgefühl* in different ways: they could be understood as *plā-tu*, *plē-ti* and help to suggest or support a verbal root *ple*, *plo*, or else, they could be analyzed into *pl-ātu*, *pl-iti* and suggested a root *pl*. We see that here as

⁶ Cf. the author's "Zur Geschichte der altfranzösischen Consonanten verbindungen."

⁷ Compare the Germanic languages, where *sk*, *sp*, *st* resist the law of consonantal shifting.

often, several circumstances coöperate in producing the same result, and I think it better, in such cases, not to emphasize any one of them to the exclusion of the others. In treating even of this ancient phase of I.-E., we must not forget that our so-called roots have been actual parts of inflected speech for ages.

There are, of course, several other reasons, why a root may move, or seem to move in more than one series.⁸ One of these possibilities is so closely related to the theory which we have proposed that we must at least mention it here; namely, the initial consonantal group is not necessarily a primary one, but it may clearly represent the weakest, vowel-less phase of a root which in its other phases contained a vowel between these consonants; then, the *eu* (as well as the *ō*, *ē*) is suffix. Thus we consider with Brugmann, 'Grundriss' ii, p. 20, that the root *sreu* is formed from *ser*, *sr*+*eu*, and, we may add *srō* from *sr-ō*, after *ῥω·ναι*, +M.-H. G. *strām*.⁹ German *strōm* can by no means be explained as a High German form; it must be one of the many Low German borrowings, and the geographical condition of Germany perhaps accounts for this one.

We must go even further and recognize also the suffix *ei*, *ī* as being capable of starting such secondary roots. From a root *bher*: 'light, heat, prepare by heat,' we have, besides the more primitive *bher* in Latin *fermentum*, perhaps *formus*, German *bärme*, *barn*, the derivative roots *bhrē*—in *βρῆς*, German *braten*; *bhreū*—in Germanic *breowan*, *brauda* and *bhreī*—in Germanic *br-ī-ya*, O.-H.G. *brīo*, modern *brei*. Also in the case of the root *streu*-, *strō*-, which I treated above from another point of view, it may be better on account of Sanskrit *stṛṇōmi*, etc., to consider *ster*, *str* as the basis from which both *streu* and *strō* arose independent of each other. The fact is that we have here two different bridges from one series to the other and it is not always possible to tell in which way the development actually took place.

As regards the history of *u*, we have seen that it disappears after initial consonantal groups which contain a sonorous consonant or *s*.

⁸ Compare, for example, Osthoff, 'M. U.', iv, *passim*.

⁹ Cf. Kluge, 'Wb.'; J. Grimm, 'D. Gr.', i³, p. 171.

That *u* should also have disappeared unconditionally after single consonants is, of course, out of the question; only as the result of a certain degree of lightness of stress,¹⁰ an early, perhaps I.-E., shortening has taken place, especially in some particles, pronouns, prepositions and the like. The root of *swa* 'so' seems to be identical with the pronominal root *sa*. The root *tu*, Germanic *pu*, loses its *u* before inflectional and derivative vowels; it is true that the second and third persons may have been shaped according to the corresponding forms of the first person, a process so common in the Romance languages. The root of the numeral *du*- may, as I believe, be recognized in the Germanic adv. prep. *tō*, *tē* (in Gothic *un-te*, *un-* from *u* as weakest phase of *in*), in Greek *-δε*, in Latin *-do*; also Latin *ad*, Germanic *at*, may in their dentals contain the remnant of *du*. As *ἀπό* is represented by Latin *ab* and *po-*, Germanic *af* and *fo-*, so an **adyō* may result in *ad*, *at*, as well as in *do*, *tō*. The meaning offers no difficulty; the idea of 'together,' 'union' would be the *tertium comparationis*. On the other hand, apparently the same root with another suffix developed the opposite meaning, that of separation 'in two,' and afterward generally a pejorative sense in *duēs*, *duś*=Greek *δύς*, Gothic *twis-standan*, Anglo-Saxon *tō*, O.H.G. *zur-* (of course, the length of A.-S. *tō-* is in compensation for the dropping of *z* or *r* before consonants, and this *tō* must not be directly identified with the preposition *tō*). Cf. also German *zwischen*, Greek *διά*.

Besides such cases where *u* was dropped on account of a lack of stress, we find a number of parallel roots with *eu-ō* after single consonants, which must be accounted for in another way. *Deu*: *dō* may be regarded as exhibiting *Lautwechsel* after the pattern of *steu*-, *stō*-, etc., but it will be seen that from another point of view a better explanation presents itself. We have seen, so far, that *u* was dropped after initial groups containing a sonorous consonant or *s*. After non-initial groups, we find *u* occurring very frequently, but so far as my collections and observations extend, there

¹⁰ Cf. Wackernagel, Kuhn's *Zs.*, xxiv. I have not access to this article and quote it according to Brugmann, 'Gr.' i, p. 163.

is no instance where this *u* does not find its natural explanation in analogy. If this be so, and we now extend the scope of our law to all positions, we shall recognize in *deu* through *duō*: *dō* the development after a word ending with a sonora or *s*; in *reu*, *rō* the development after any consonant. But after a word ending in a mute, we expect to see an initial mute before *u* disappear; cf. *q̄turto-k̄yartos*, and similarly, before *r*, *q̄trūtā*: *krūtā*. In this way we arrive at some interesting equations:

After vowels, the derivation *du-eno* from the root *du* 'worship,' remained I.-E. *dueno*, Latin *benum*='venerated, venerable, good.'

After sonorous consonants or *s* *du-ōno* became I.-E. *dōno*-; Latin *donum*, cf. German 'verehren'='schenken.' *Du-ōtis*: δῶσις; *du-as*: Latin **das*,-in *dare*, *dari* 'worshipping, offering, gift, give.' The ending *ri* of the Latin infinitive passive is derived, as I take it, from nouns in *i*, while the active endings come from consonantal stems, *opus*: *opere*=**facus*: *facere* and *opere*: *mensi*=*dare*: *dari*. The meaning was in both cases originally that of a true infinitive, expressing the idea of action in its most general sense, regardless of the passive or of the active use; compare Gothic *du saihvan im*. Only later, when these nominal cases were more closely connected with the verbal system, the forms in *-re* assumed an active, those in *-ri* mostly a passive, meaning.—In Latin *du-eria* we have the first, *nebentonige Tiefstufe*.

In the same way we have from the numeral root *du*, the following forms, besides the first *Tiefstufe* in the trisyllabic *duellum*, in *duo*, etc.: 1.—after a vowel *du* remains *du*: Latin *b* in *bellum*, *bis*; Germanic *tuis*, etc.; 2.—after a sonorous consonant or *s*, *du* becomes *d*: Latin *d*, Greek *δ*, Germanic *t*, High German *z*: —*Dellus*, 'warlike,' *deleo*, δηλέομαι, δόλος, etc., δαρτέομαι, German *verzetteln*; 3.—after a mute the *d* of *du* was dropped: —*kt̄yrtos*: *k̄yrtos* =*et dueik̄nti*: *et ueik̄nti*, in Γεικοῖ, Latin *viginti*, Sanskrit *vin̄cati*; Latin *ve*- in *vepallidus*, etc., perhaps *v̄num*, *v̄neo*, Greek ὠνέομαι (?); Gothic *wi-thra*, etc.

An illustrative Latin sentence, representing the various developments of the root *du* would be: *duos et viginti bellum debebat*, which at an earlier I.-E. epoch would have read about as

follows if the Latin formation had existed: *d̄uō̄ns et d̄uei[d(e)] k̄nti d̄uēlōm d̄uēl̄i bh̄yat*.

Exactly as in 1. *duellum*, 2. *deleo*, 3. *viginti* we find the three branches represented in

1. *k̄yap*, *k̄yap*: Lit. *k̄vap̄as*, Latin *cupere*.

2. *kap*: καπνός, Skt. *k̄api*, *k̄apila*.

3. *vap*: Lat. *vapor*; in

1. *tuer*: Germanic **p̄ueras*, German *quer*, Old Norse *p̄verr*, *p̄ver-úð* 'rage,' τὸ πύνη, Latin *tor-queo*, German *Zwerg*, originally 'missgestalt,' 'torso'; perhaps Old Norse *thurs*, etc.

2. *ter*: Latin *tero*, *terebra* from *teresra*, Germanic *br̄a(f)an*, Lat. *ter-gum*, τρεπω, etc.

3. *uer*: Latin *verro*, *verrunco*, *ver-to*, Germanic *werran* 'verwirren' *werpan* 'turn.'

Not all my materials are as self-evident as these; the original conditions were, of course, disturbed by cross-influences. Additional cases might be quoted, but the law I believe is sufficiently established.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

RECENT OPINION CONCERNING THE RIDDLES OF THE EXETER BOOK.

Two specialists have recently spoken on this subject, Sievers in *Anglia*, and George Herzfeld in "Die Räthsel des Exeterbuches und ihr Verfasser" (Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1890). The object of this note is merely to call attention to the conclusions reached by these investigators.

1. Sievers would assign the riddles to an earlier date than that of the Cynewulfian writings. He says (*Anglia* xiii, 19):

"Das gesamtresultat dieser sich gegenseitig stützenden erwägungen ist also, dass die erste aufzeichnung der rätsel in die periode des *i* und die noch früher zu ende gehende periode des auslautenden *-b*, des *a* vor nasalen und des unumgelauteten *a* vor *u* fällt; also auch vermutlich in die zeit vor Cynewulf, der seinen namen selbst mit *e* schreibt. Man müsste denn, um die annahme Cynewulf sei der verfasser der rätsel, festzuhalten, weiterhin es für wahrscheinlich erklären wollen, dass Cynewulf in seiner jugend *i* und im alter *e* geschrieben habe."

2. Herzfeld inclines to think that they should be ascribed to Cynewulf. His words are:

"Nach meiner Ansicht ist es zwar nicht unbedingt sicher, aber doch in hohem Grade wahr-

scheinlich, dass die Räthsel in ihrem vollen Umfange den Dichter Cynewulf zum Verfasser haben. Das stilistische Moment führt uns freilich nicht direct zu diesem Ergebniss, auch nicht die Betrachtung des Wortschatzes, wohl aber die Gemeinsamkeit einer grossen Menge von charakteristischen Ausdrücken und Anschauungen, die Behandlung der Quellen und vor Allem die Aehnlichkeit in Verskunst und Sprache. Eine nothwendige Voraussetzung ist dabei, dass die Räthsel ein Jugendwerk des Dichters sind, was ich S. 9. 16. 56. zu begründen versucht habe."

In an appendix Herzfeld continues (p. 71):

"In einem jüngst erschienenen Aufsatz über Cynewulf (*Anglia* xiii, 1 ff.) hat Sievers auf Grund grammatischer Erwägungen die Ansicht geäussert, dass nichts uns hindere, die Räthsel des Exeterbuchs vor Cynewulf zu verlegen. Ich habe mich nun allerdings von der Stichhaltigkeit seiner Gründe nicht überzeugen können. Wenn es nämlich feststeht, dass die Hauptwerke Cy.'s nach 750 zu setzen sind, so bereitet die Datirung der Räthsel, wofür man sie, wie oben wiederholt betont wurde, als ein Jugendwerk des Dichters ansieht, nur geringe Schwierigkeit. Ich denke, sie werden etwa im zweiten Viertel des achten Jahrhunderts entstanden sein, also grade in der Zeit, in welcher die von Sievers geschilderten Lautübergänge sich vollzogen."

3. Herzfeld and Sievers agree in denying Cynewulf's authorship of the first Riddle. Herzfeld says (pp. 67-8):

"Nach dem Gesagten wird man also wohl zugeben müssen, dass es gewagt ist, dies Stück Cynewulf zuzuschreiben."

Sievers' view is thus expressed (*Anglia* xiii, 19):

"Aber was führt denn überhaupt zur annahme der identität des rätseldichters mit Cynewulf? Im gründe doch nichts, als Leo's unmögliche deutung des ersten rätsels auf den namen *Cynewulf*. Ich sage mit bedacht 'unmögliche deutung.'"

In his appendix Herzfeld adds (p. 72):

"Gegen Leo's Deutung des ersten Räthsels hat sich nun auch Sievers mit guten Gründen ausgesprochen. Leider hat er die Bradley'sche Hypothese mit Stillschweigen übergangen, die es uns ermöglicht, auch nach Ausscheidung des so viele Schwierigkeiten bereitenden ersten Stückes die übrigen Räthsel Cynewulf zuzuthellen."

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

NEW TEXTS OF THE OLD ENGLISH LORD'S PRAYER AND HYMNS.

SINCE the publication of my article on 'The

Evolution of the Lord's Prayer in English' (*American Journal of Philology* xii, 59-66), Professor J. M. Hart, of Cornell University, obligingly reminds me of the version found in *Anglia* xi, 100. On comparing this more critically with the versions printed in my article, I find that it must be derived from what I have there called *Ælf. 2*, that is, from the translation of the Lord's Prayer printed in *Ælfric's 'Homilies,'* ed. Thorpe, vol. ii, p. 596. That the evidence may be accessible to those interested, both forms are here reproduced. Dr. Logeman retains the punctuation of the manuscript in printing the Prayer in *Anglia*: here I modernize it, and expand the contraction for *and*. Otherwise I reproduce both texts as they are in the books. That from the 'Homilies' stands first.

"Du ure Fæder, þe eart on heofenum, sy ðin nama gehalgod. Gecume þin rice. Sy ðin willa swa swa on heofenum swa eac on eorðan. Syle us to-dæg urne dæghwomlican hláf, and forgif us ure gyltas swa we forgyfað þam de wið us agyltað. And ne læt þu na us on costnunge, ac alys us fram yfele. Sy hit swa."

"Du ure Fæder, ðe eart on heofonum, sy þin nama gehalgod. Gecume þin rice. Si þin willa swa on heofonum and eac on eorðan. Syle us to-dæg urne dæghwomlican hláf, and forgif us ure gyltas swa swa we forgyfað þam þe wið us agyltað. And ne læt þu na us on costnunge, ac alys us fram yfele. Si hit swa."

These two versions agree in the following peculiarities as against all others that I have cited: *Gecume, swa (swa, on heofenum (heofonum) swa (and) eac on eorðan, dæghwomlican*. That in *Anglia* agrees with *Ælfric* in general as against all other versions in these particulars:

"Du ure Fæder, Sy ðin willa, Syle us (nu) to-dæg urne dæghwamlican (dæghwomlican) hlaf, ðam (mannum) ðe wið us agyltað, ná, ac alys us fram yfele, Sy hit swa."

Ælfric's paraphrase of the sixth petition in the course of his homily, *Ne gedafa, ðu God, þæt we beon gelædde on costnunge*, can hardly be considered to outweigh these correspondences. Besides, we must note the agreement of the accent in *hláf, us, læd (læt)*, as reproduced above. The agreement with *Ælfric* is confirmed by the fact that the two versions quoted are followed in their respective places by the same document, in each case entitled "*Se læssa creda*." I reproduce that given in the

'Homilies,' and append a collation with that in *Anglia*:

"Ic gelyfe on God, Fæder Ælmihtigne, Scyppend¹ heofenan and eorðan; and ic gelyfe² on Hælend Crist, his āncennedan Sunu, urne Drihten, se wæs geeacnod of ðam Halgan Gaste, and acenned of Marian þam mædene, geðrowod under ðam Pontiscan Pilate, on rôde ahāngen, hé wæs dead and bebyrged,³ and hé niðer-astāh to helle, and hé arás of deaðe on ðam ðriddan dæge, and hé astāh úp to heofenum,⁵ and sitt⁶ nu æt swiðran Godes Ælmihtiges Fæder, þanon hé wyle⁷ cuman to démenne ægðer ge ðam cucum ge ðam deadum. And ic gelyfe⁸ on ðone Halgan Gast, and ða halgan gelaðunge, and halgena gemænnysse, and synna forgifennysse,⁹ and flæsces ærist, and þæt ece lif. Sy hit swa."

¹Scyppend. ²gelive. ³gebyrged. ⁴omit he. sheofonum. ⁵sit. ⁶wile. ⁷gelyve. ⁸omit and synna forchange. The collation disregards the interchange of *p* and *ð*, and the contraction for *and*.

The form printed by Logeman is apparently the later, if we may judge from the omissions, and from spellings like *gelive* (*gelyve*.)

On page 103 of the same volume of *Anglia*, Logeman prints from MS. 427 of Lambeth Palace Library what he calls an oration (*sic*). It needs only a glance to show that it consists of the whole of the first Hymn printed by Grein in his 'Bibliothek,' ii, 280, and a part of the second, given on page 281. Grein's text goes back to Cott. Jul. A 2 of the British Museum. It is interesting, therefore, to have this second, if inferior, form. I collate Logeman's text with Grein's, citing by the line-numbers in the latter, and noting *p*'s and *ð*'s, but ignoring contractions for *and*. Note that Grein's stands first.

Hymn I. 2 geara: geare. 3 saule: sawle. 4 hy: heo. 5 ealdor: aldor. 6 forþan: forþon; eðest: epest. 7 þæra: ðara; vide oððe side: side oððe wide.

Hymn II. 1 beorht: brihta; folkes scyppend: folces scyppend. 2 gemiltsa: gemilda. 3 sile: syle; þine: ðine. 4 byð: bið. 5 deofle: deoflum; campað: com pað. 6 mirigðe: myrigðe. 7 he þa: omit. 8 bute: butan; yfeles: yfles. 9-13 wanting in Lambeth MS. 427.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

NOTES ON THE CANADIAN-FRENCH DIALECT OF GRANBY

(PROVINCE OF QUEBEC).

I. Vocabulary.

The data here recorded were obtained in June, 1891, from Mr. M., a French-Canadian of Worcester, Mass. Mr. M., who is about thirty years of age, was born in Granby, Province of Quebec, and before coming to Worcester (where he has been living for about twelve months) he had resided for three years in Manchester, N. H. He is a man of considerably more than average intelligence, and stated that the information given to the writer would fairly represent the chief peculiarities of the speech of his native place.

The investigation was undertaken mainly on the lines of the excellent paper of Prof. Squair on the dialect of the district of Ste. Anne de Beaupré,¹ with a view of ascertaining, if possible, the difference of speech which is believed to exist between the various districts of French Canada.

With regard to the vocabulary, the following facts were ascertained:

a. Of words contained in Oscar Dunn's 'Glossaire Franco-Canadien,'² these were known to M. in the sense given by Dunn:

Abattre, a (=elle), abîmer, asteure, avoine (faire manger de l'avoine à quelqu'un), bâdrer, bombarde, bordée de neige, brassée (s.v. bras-sin), cage, cageux, campe, capot, carriole, catalogue, chantier, coppe, créature, croûte, dégrader, doutance (avoir doutance de), éplucher, épluchette, érablière, escousse, étriver (faire étriver quelqu'un), gas, goudrelle, i(=il, ils), itou, lisse, mitasse, mocassin, on (=nous), patinoir, poudre, poudrerie, pivart, retapper (se faire retapper) routeur, saut, smart, souris-chaude, sucrerie, talle, ti, tiendre, tignasse, timon, tinton, tire, tirer, tocson, tombe, tombée de la nuit, tondre, toquer, touche, tous-jours, tourne, tournement, trâlée, traîne, traîne sauvage, traîneau, travail, traverse, trem-pette, tricolier, tuque⁽¹⁾, tripoter, volier, voyageur, yéya.

b. The following words have significations, additional to, or different from, those given by Dunn:

Amarrer (second *a* like *o* of English *nor*).
To kill: J'vâ! amôré—I am going to kill it.

¹ *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute*, 1888, pp. 161-168.

² Québec, 1880.

Babiche (the *i* quite short, babĭc). Eelskin cut into strips.

Baissière (bâsyêr). Water below the dam in a river.

Bourdillon (bûrdiÿô). Lump. J'ai été triyer [trier] de la gomme, et j'en ai un gros *bourdillon*. See Dunn, *s.v.* *Bourguignon*, which appears to be the same word.

Carriole. A buffalo-robe.

Dégradé. Ruined by drink.

Glissoire. Toboggan-slide.

Talle. A flower-bed.

Timon. Spoke of a wheel.

Tocson. A male sheep.

Tourtière. A thick "pie" made of potatoes and onions, without meat.

Tremette. Bit of bread and eggs soaked or boiled together.

c. The following differ somewhat in form from the corresponding words in Dunn:

Galendar (last *a* like *aw* in English *saw*). A crosscut saw. See Dunn, *s.v.* *Godendard*.

Savagesse. " *s.v.* *Sauvagesse*.

Tabagâne. " *s.v.* *Tobogane*.

Tapin. " *s.v.* *Taupin*.

Tyignasse. " *s.v.* *Tignasse*.

d. The following words given in Dunn were unknown to M.: Micmac, teurs, toque, torgnole.

A comparison of the words (not in Dunn), given by Prof. Squair as known in the district of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, with the list furnished by M., results thus:

a. The following words recorded by Prof. Squair are known to M., in the sense given by him:

Autre. The locution *l'autre mois* is very common, according to Mr. M.; belouet: 'A sort of berry' M.—Probably the blue-berry; bête-puante, bois-blanc, braierie, braye, brayage, brayeur, brayeuse, corvée, crine, épinette blanche, épinette rouge, fiche, gibier, gond, icite, javelier, gond, mil, pierre de meule, planche, sapin, par secousses, taure.

b. The following words have meanings, in the dialect of M., additional to, or different from, those given by Prof. Squair:

Fiche. A railroad spike.

Quintreau. A measure of oats or wheat.

Pruché. Spruce.

Siffleu. Wood-chuck, or ground-hog.

c. Of the words recorded by Prof. Squair the following were unknown to M.:

Biseau, devers, filer, morfiler, raie, râpe-savage.

The following words, obtained from M., are not to be found in Dunn's 'Glossaire,' nor in the additional list of Prof. Squair:

Allége. Empty. Veux-tu embarquer avec moi. Je suis-t-*allége*.

Aya! To the left! Used in guiding horses.

The final *a* is like *aw* in English *law*.

Comp. Eng. *haw*!

Barre de fer. Crowbar.

Bois-franc. Hardwood.

Bois-fort. Thick forest.

†Bourbotte. Bull-pout.

†Catherinette. A sort of wild strawberry with a large leaf. Not the plant called *fraise savage*.

Chat savage. Raccoon.

Chaussure savage. Mocassins. More used than the latter word.

Chienne. A "linen-duster." L'v'là avec sa *chienne* su l'dos.

Coulée. Ditch. This locution is found in the region of the city of Quebec.

Crapais (krapè). A sort of flat fish.

Désert. A clearing in the woods.

Dji! To the right! Used in guiding horses. Cf. English *Gee*!

†Egoine. A hand-saw.

Enayée. Milk-dry. Ma vache est enayée cette année.

Fraise savage. Wild strawberry.

†Gadelle. Currant. *Gadelier*, currant-bush. *Vin d'gadelle*, currant-wine.

Loche. The animalculæ which appear in rain-water left standing for some time.

Musique à bouche. Mouth-organ.

Noix amère. Beech-nut. The word *fatne* was unknown to M.

Nordais(?) [*nordè*, sometimes *norda*]. A northerly wind.

Outarde. Wild goose. The forms *outard* and *outarte* were not known to M.

Patak [sometimes *patak*]. Potato. The form *patate* is also in use.

Perchaude. A fish of the perch kind.

Pichou. The lynx or wild-cat.

Pipe de gaz. Gas pipe.

†See Littré.

Potasse. Soft soap. *Potasserie*, soap-kitchen.
Raccorder un piano. To tune a piano.

†Rond à patiner. Skating-rink.

Sapinette=*petit sapin*. M. used the phrase *la bière de sapinette* in the sense of spruce beer." In some parts of French Canada *sapinette* alone is used with this signification.

Savane (second *a* like *aw* in English *law*).
Swamp, or overflowed meadow-land.

Soupâne. Oat-meal porridge. This is doubtless the *suppawm* of American English, a word of Algonkian Indian origin. M. uses also the French word *gruau*.

Suisse. Chipmunk.

Tassage. Heap of hay thrown down from the loft and trampled upon: *Tâchez de faire un bon tassage*.

Tourniquet. Somersault: *L'eau fait un tourniquet en descendant*.

With regard to vocabulary, it will be necessary for us to have more data before we can say much about dialect, though there is reason to believe that some characteristic differences do exist between the speech of one portion of the province and that of another. Whether some of the words given in the above list are peculiar to Granby I cannot say, but I presume that the great majority of them belong to the common stock of the French language of Canada.

On another occasion, the writer hopes to be able to treat of the phonology of the Granby dialect, but would, before closing, like to call attention to the curious parasitic *t* in the following locutions frequently used by M.:

Je suis-t- allége. My sleigh is empty.

Un gros-t- homme. A big man.

This appears to be from analogy with such cases as *a-t-il*, *va-t-il*, etc., but the use in *gros-t-homme*, is remarkable.

A. F. CHAMBERLAIN.

Clark University.

THE RUSSIAN VERB AND ITS ACCENT.

Two features of the Russian grammar, as all who have studied the language will bear witness, are peculiarly difficult for beginners: the

†See Littré.

verb with its bewildering 'aspects'; the tonic accent with its lawless migrations from ultima to preantepenultima. On the first point, whoever cares to make a thorough study of the subject will find all that can be desired in the chapters "Lehre von der Conjugation" ("russisch", p. 313-331 of vol. 3) and "vom Verbum" (p. 261-340 of vol. 4) of Miklosich's monumental work, 'Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen'. Even those who are not able to read the German may now have the benefit of Miklosich's researches, since the substance of these chapters is embodied in Prof. Morfill's scholarly 'Grammar of the Russian Language,' issued two years ago from the Clarendon Press. But on the second point, the tonic accent, good authorities are not so readily accessible. For my own purposes, I have found of practical service a little treatise by A. Bystrow, 'Regeln über den Accent in der russischen Sprache' (Mitau: 1884), though I would advise that it be looked upon rather as basis for one's own observations than as *savio duca*. Its generalizations are sometimes too sweeping. Prof. Morfill, on the ground that his grammar is rudimentary and the subject abstruse, omits the treatment of accent altogether, recommending, however, to advanced students and to such as can read the Russian language, J. Grot's 'Filologicheskaya Razuiskaniya' [3d ed., St. Petersburg: 1885] as the best available work on the subject. Grot's 'Researches' consists of two volumes of miscellaneous essays and reviews, intended, as his sub-title indicates, to furnish "material for dictionaries, grammars, and histories of the Russian language." The portion treating of accent, extending from p. 354 to p. 473, comprises four essays: 1. "On the Conjugation of the Russian Verb and the Importance thereof of the Tonic Accent"; 2. "On Verbs with Movable Accent"; 3. "On Russian Accent in general, and more especially on the Accent of Substantives"; 4. "A propos of a German Pamphlet on Russian Accent", [a review of L. Kayssler's 'Die Lehre vom russischen Accent']. So far as my knowledge goes, none of these papers, either by way of translation or of abstract, has been brought to the knowl-

1 See the paper by Mr. C. B. Cayley in *Engl. Philol. Soc. Trans.*, 1880-1, p. 51, "On a Difficulty in Russian Grammar".

edge of English readers—an oversight which has worked, I believe, to the misfortune of the latter, since many of the “researches” are certainly worth the careful attention of English and American philologists. In this article it is my purpose to present a brief summary of the first of the essays mentioned, that on the conjugation and accent of the verb.

Prof. Grot first points out why the accentuation of the verb is a difficult subject to master: 1. the accent is on different syllables in different verbs; 2. in some verbs it shifts from one syllable to another in the conjugation of the present or future indicative, as in the case of *smotryétb* which in the 1st pers. ind. is *smotryú*, in the other persons *smótrishb*, *smótritz*, etc.; 3. the infinitive, the form by which we commonly know the verb, is sometimes a clue to the accent of the remaining forms, sometimes not. How may this chaos be reduced to order? As our knowledge of the verb is always referred to its principal parts, the author inquires next what forms of the verb are best adapted to serve at once as guides to the accent and to the conjugation. Three forms are commonly given; a. the infinitive; b. the 1st, and c. the 2nd pers. sing. pres. (or future) ind. Of these the infinitive is retained by Prof. Grot for its usefulness in determining other forms, but against the employment of the 1st pers. sing. several arguments are advanced.

1. With regard to accentuation, this form generally has the accent on the same syllable as the infinitive; thus, *pónnítb*, *pómnyu*; *derzhátb*, *derzhú*. Exceptions to this rule are such monosyllabic verbs as *pyetb*, *pastb*, *klástb*, *klyastb* (1st pers. *poyú*, *pasú*, *kladú*, *klyanú*); *berécb* of which the 1st pers. is *beregú*; and five verbs in which the present tense has two different endings, viz:

<i>alkátb</i>	1st pers. <i>alkáyu</i> or <i>álchu</i> ,
<i>kolnuikhátb</i>	“ <i>kolnuikháyu</i> or <i>kolnuishu</i> ,
<i>stradátb</i>	“ <i>stradáyu</i> or <i>strázhdú</i> ,
<i>khromátb</i>	“ <i>khromáyu</i> or <i>khramlyu</i> .
<i>kolebátb</i>	“ <i>kolebáyu</i> (obs.) or <i>koléblyu</i> ,

To these should be added, for completeness, the two obsolete verbs *zhadátb* (1st pers. *zhadáyu* or *zházhdú*), *imátb* (1st pers. *imáyu* or *émlyu*).

2. The second objection to the 1st pers. sing. ind. as one of the principal parts is that its ending is not sufficiently significant to serve as

a guide to the conjugation of the verb. For example, the forms *vyazhu*, *vozhu*, *sizhu*, *derzhu*, correspond to infinitives so various as *vyazatb*, *vodítb* (or *voztb*), *sidyetb*, *derzhatb*. Moreover the 1st sing. can be found from any one of the other personal forms.

3. The other personal forms agree with one another in having the same accent. This is often different from that of the 1st pers. sing., and in such case the accent in the 1st sing. is always on the ultimate and in the other on the penultimate; thus, *rublyú*, *rúbishb*, etc.; *derzhú*, *dérzhishb*, etc. The reverse, that is, accent on penultimate in 1st pers. sing. and on the ultimate in the rest, never occurs. While, therefore, we may infer the accent of the 1st pers. sing. from that of one of the other personal forms, the reverse inference is barred.

Since then 1. it is easier to find the 1st pers. sing. from one of the other personal forms than the reverse, and 2. the accent of the 1st pers. (already known from the infinitive) is not a clue to the accent of the rest, the conclusion is obvious that some one of the other five forms should take precedence over it. But which one of the other has the strongest claim? The endings of the 2nd and 3rd pers. sing. and of the 1st and 2nd pers. plur. do not differ in the first vowel; it is always *e* or *i*. The vowel of the 3d pers. ending, however, is variable, as shown in *ber-utb*, *por-yutb*, *vid-yatb*, *derzhatb*; nor to these variations will any of the preceding personal forms (except the debarred 1st pers. sing.) serve as a guide. These considerations point to the 3d pers. plur. as the most eligible, a conclusion confirmed by the fact that the 3d plur. often retains the root of the verb in its pure form.

Selecting as principal parts, therefore, the 3d pers. plur. and the infinitive, it remains to show how from these two forms all the other forms may be derived.²

I. *The 1st person singular*.—1. When the 3d plur. ends in *utb* or *yutb*, to obtain the form of the 1st sing. drop *tb*.³ With regard to the accentuation, two cases may arise: a. If the 3d

² The ‘aspects’ excepted.

³ The *u* of the 1st sing. is not the same in origin as the *u* of the 3d plur. “Die Personalendung der I. sg. (*m*) bildet mit dem praesensvocal *o* ein *u* in allen jenen Fällen, in denen im Altslovenischen *a* steht. . . . Das *n* der III. pl. schmilzt mit dem praesensvocal *u* zu *u* für *asl. a* zusammen” [Miklosich, ‘Vergl. Gramm. d. slav. Sprachen’ iii, p. 313]. But the difference, as Grot points out, is, for his purpose, of no practical account.

plur. ending be *utz* or *yutz* or if the ending be *yutz* unaccented and preceded by a vowel, the place of the accent is the same in 1st sing. and 3d plur. Thus the infinitive in such cases need not be taken into account. Examples are: *pluivutz*, *pluivú*; *dayútz*, *dayú*; *myenydyutz*, *myenydyu*; *dyéistvuyutz*, *dyéistvuyu*.⁴ b. If *utz* or *yutz* be preceded by a consonant and the accent be on the penultimate, the 1st sing. takes the accent of the infinitive. Thus, *ryé-zat6*, *ryézhutz*, *ryézhú*; *plákat6*, *pláchnu*; (accent of infinitive and 3d sing. different) *kolót6*, *kólyutz*, *kolyú*.⁵

2. When the 3d plur. ends in *atz* or *yatz*, to obtain the 1st sing. change *atz* to *u*, *yatz* to *yu*. The rule for accent is the same as under 1. Thus: a. *velyátz*, *velyú*; *treshchátz*, *treshchú*; *smoyátz*, *smoyú*. b. *pómniú6*, *pómnyatz*, *pómnyu*; (acc. of 3d sing. and infin. different) *valít6*, *vályatz*, *valyú*. Some apparent exceptions to these rules may be accounted for by the regular mutations of vowels and consonants.

II. *The 2d and 3d sing. and 1st and 2d plur.*—These forms may be readily obtained by changing *utz* or *yutz*, of the 3d plur. into *esh6*, *ets*, *emz*, *ete*; *atz*, or *yatz*, into *ish6*, *íte*, *ímz*, *ítz*. The accent is always the same as that of the 3d plur. It should be noticed, in passing, that when the ending *utz* is preceded by *g* or *k* these consonants, before the *e* of the other personal endings, are changed to *zh* and *ch* respectively.

III. *Present passive participle in -6muit.*—This appears only when the 3d plur. ends in *ite* (accented). Thus: *nesúte*, *nes6muit*. An exception to the rule is *iskát6*, 3d plur. *ishchut6*, pass. part. *isk6muit*.

IV. *Past tense (past active participle in -l).* The form presents no difficulty, since it is readily derivable, in most cases, from the infinitive stem; but the accent is variable, as is seen in *syékla*, *teklá*. In verbs of which the infinitives end in *zt6*, *st6*, the accent of the past tense is determined by the original form of the termination. Such of these verbs as originally had the termination *zti* or *sti*, or have retained

⁴ Query *dyéistvuyu*?

⁵ The five verbs with variable accent, referred to above form partial exceptions to this rule. Another apparent exception, *moch6*, of which the 1st sing. is *mogu*, becomes regular if the original infinitive *moshchú* be taken into account.

that form, take the accent on the participial suffix. Thus: *vest6* (orig. *vezti*). *vezlá*, *vezl6*, *vezli*; *pasti*, *paslá* etc.⁶ Otherwise, the accent, in these verbs, is not found on the suffix. On the same principle we may account for *strígla*, *syékla* from *strich6*, *czech6*, the original infinitives being *strígti*, *cyékti*.

The reflexive forms of the past tense present some peculiarities. If the accent in verbs in *t6*, is on the feminine suffix *-la*, the reflexive masc. and neut. sing. and the plural will be accented on the final syllable. Thus: *rvalá*, *rvalsýá*, *rvalós6*, *rvalis6*; *gnalá*, *gnalsýá*, *gnalós6*, *gnalis6*. (But, without the reflexive suffix, *rválo*, *rváli*; *gnálo*, *gnáli*.) The feminine form of the reflexive retains the accent on the suffix *-la*. Thus: *rvalás6*, *gnalás6*, etc.

V. *Past passive participle in -nz.*—The accent of this participle may be determined, to some extent, from that of the preceding. If, in verbs in *-ch6*, *-zt6*, *-st6*, the suffix *-la*, *-lo*, *-li* is unaccented, the suffix *-nz* will be unaccented also. Thus: *gruizla*, *gruizenz*; *syékla*, *syéchenz*. In the following and similar verbs the accent is on the suffix throughout: *vesti*, *velá*, *vedénz*; *vezti*, *vezlá*, *vezénz*, *vlech6*, *vleklá*, *vlechénz*; *beréch6* (beregti), *bereglá*, *berezhénz*.

As irregular must be classed: 1. those verbs in which the 3d plur. does not serve as a guide to the other persons of the present (future) tense. Such are *byezhat6*, 3d plur. *byegutz*, of which the other personal forms are *byezhish6*, *-itz*, *-imz*, *-ite*; *chlit6*, 3d plur. *chtyatz*, 1st sing. *chlu*; *khotyet6*, 3d plur. *khotyatz*, 2d sing. *khochesh6*, 3d sing. *khochetz*; *yest6*, 3d plur. *yedyatz*, 1st sing. *yemz*, 2d sing. *yesh6*, 3d sing. *yestz*: *dat6*, 3d plur. *dadut*, 1st sing. *damez*, 2d sing. *dash6*, etc.

2. Verbs in which the past tense cannot be found from the 3d plur. pres. ind., as, *itti*, 3d plur. *idutz*, past part. *shelz*;⁷ and *shibit6*, 3d plur. *shibutz*, past part. *shibz*.

⁶ The following list of verbs in which the *i* is retained through the influence of the accent, is given by Miklosich ('Vergl. Gramm. d. slav. Sprachen', iii. 314.): *blyustí*, *brestí*, *priobestí*, *vestí*, *vyastí*, *gnestí*, *nestí*, *pastí*, *plestí*, *rostí*, [*rasí*], *tryastí*, *izvyestí*. Other verbs that fall under the rule are: *mestí* (*melí*), *polzti* (*polzá*), and *skrestí* (*skreblá*). If the ordinary grammars and accented texts may be trusted, (a wild hypothesis,) *myastí* is an exception, the past participial forms being *myalz*, *myála*, *myálo*, *myáli*.

⁷ Strictly speaking, not an exception, since, as Grot points out, the form *shelz* is from another verb (namely, *sh6d*).

3. Verbs of which the imperative cannot be determined, as *lech6*, 3d plur. *lyagutz*, imp. *lyagz*; *yest6*, 3d plur. *yedyatz*, imp. *yesh6*; *suipat6*, 3d plur. *suiplyutz*, imp. *suip6*.

In other cases of irregularity, Grot thinks that the relations between the two principle parts may furnish a clue to the relations between certain parts of forms.

These fragmentary observations on the verb and its accent will seem meagre only to those who have not had dealings with the standard Russian grammars and dictionaries—works in which the art of concealing what the student most desires to know is carried to a high degree of perfection. From this sweeping condemnation, I should like to make an exception in favor of the indispensable treatise by Prof. Morfill; yet admirable as that little work is in some respects, its sins of omission make of it, for the beginner, that sort of reading which is proverbially said to be the outcome of 'easy writing.' In this regard the author might have taken hints from certain American writers who in their short grammars have happily combined brevity of treatment with lucidity and thoroughness of exposition. To mention but a single point. If in his vocabulary, at the end of the book, Prof. Morfill had indicated the class or group to which each verb and noun belongs according to Miklosich's arrangement, how greatly would not its value have been enhanced? True, the student that is desperately resolved upon mastering the language at all hazards, learns these things in time by brute force, so to speak; but in the case of so difficult a subject as Russian grammar why dishearten him at the outset?

NOTE.

The system of transliteration used, by way of experiment, in this article, is that proposed in *Nature* for February 27, 1890 (see also p. 534-5 of the same volume). It represents the combined wisdom of a conference composed of Mr. W. H. Flower, Prof. W. R. Morfill and other scholars of equal repute.

In the present article I have preferred to retain *g* for the Russian *г* and to use *z* and *σ* for strong and weak *е* mute. Attention must also be called to the fact that *ε=и'*, not *э*. The use of *ε=з* seems to me a defect of the system proposed in *Nature* if the use of the latter is to be extended to philological purposes (it was de-

signed merely for the transcription of proper names); the substitution of *ē* for *é* would remove the objection. Other systems of transliteration are discussed in the *Library Journal* for 1885, p. 302-9, in the *New Englander* for May, 1891, and in a note at the close of the article by Mr. Cayley referred to above.

FRED N. SCOTT.

University of Michigan.

WEBSTER'S INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY.

THE NEW WEBSTER AND THE "GUIDE TO
PRONUNCIATION."

THE 'International Dictionary,' as the new edition of Webster is called, presents many new features, and makes a decided advance upon all previous issues. It is evident that much time and effort have been spent in trying to place the new dictionary on a thoroughly modern basis. For many reasons which a casual glance will indicate, it may be said to be worthy of the new American scholarship—a term that is to mean more in the next quarter century than at any time in the past. It is not the present purpose, however, to notice more than a chapter of the 'International,' namely that called a "Guide to Pronunciation."

Here also we may say there is much to be commended, especially in the attempt to follow the more accurate phonetics of modern science. But there are some points to which exceptions may reasonably be taken, and it is my purpose to advance some of these in the spirit of candid criticism. The chapter on the vowel system (§ 5-25) says, that it "agrees, in its general features and the main part of the nomenclature, with that advanced by Alexander Melville Bell and the same as modified by Henry Sweet; though differing from both in some points of considerable importance." And yet the modifications of Sweet differ so markedly from the original system of Bell, that it is difficult to see how this statement can be strictly true, while it is more difficult to see the improvement that has been made. For example, Bell makes the English long vowels narrow (or primary) while Sweet in his later books (see the 'Primer of Phonetics,' 1890) regards most of these together with the short vowels as wide. The 'International' follows Bell apparently, and seems

to go so far as to consider 'narrow' and 'wide' the equivalents of 'long' and 'short.' Thus we have such terms as 'narrow long' and 'wide short,' and the statement that "all the wide [vowels] are naturally short and the narrow naturally long" (§ 21). This is certainly no distinction made by Sweet and its accuracy may be questioned. For instance the wide vowels of the "Guide" are, *a* (ask), *a* (am), *o* (odd), *u* (up), *e* (end), *i* (ill), *oŭ* (foot). These would be called short, or 'naturally short' as above; but surely *ā* (ask) is not a short vowel in America, whether the quality is that given by the 'International,' or that of flat *a*, as in at, or of broad *a*, as in London English.

The subject of quantity is still further obscured by the use of several other terms. We have pointed out the use of 'narrow long' and 'wide short.' It is then said that "vowels are distinguished as *intrinsically*, or *naturally* long or short, etc." (§ 30). Still another distinction is made in § 22, where we read:

"The sounds symbolized by *ā, ē, ī, ō, ū*, as being the most frequent of the long sounds denoted by these letters, are called their REGULAR LONG sounds, etc."

In this last statement it is evident we are again on the ground of the old spelling book with its five vowels *a, e, i, o, u*, and sometimes *w* and *y*. The real difficulty is, that the attempt has been made to make these sections on phonetics both scientific and popular, and the result is a confusion of scientific terms with popular and non-phonetic nomenclature.

One other point in the use of terms should be noted. It is suggested by the following sentence:

"All the regular long vowels, as also all the diphthongs, may form the closing element of an accented syllable (as *dāy, ēvil, liar*, etc.), while the regular short naturally have the syllable closed by a consonant sound (as *atom, copy, city*, etc.); though such words as *condition, national*, etc., can not well be so divided in writing and print."

The implication here in regard to open and closed syllables is phonetically inaccurate and misleading. For not only is it more common to regard a vowel followed by a single consonant as an open syllable, but it is equally accurate in a phonetic sense. Indeed the most that can be claimed by those who accept the

other view is, that the consonant belongs in such cases equally to both syllables. Moreover, as it seems certain that a single consonant between vowels can not have the same influence upon the preceding sound as in a syllable strictly closed by a consonant, it is better in all cases to regard the vowel followed by a single consonant within the word as an open syllable. At least it is not advisable to quote examples of open and closed syllables, in the sense in which the terms have just been defined, to show the effect of a consonant upon a preceding vowel. For instance in § 49 *ā* is said to occur "only in syllables closed by *r*," after which the examples are *care, share, compare, parent*. The criticism is justified, and the distinction above is half conceded in a statement in the same section:

"The *a* before *r* does not ordinarily take this sound when the *r* precedes a vowel or another *r* in the following syllable of a word; as in *parity, parry, comparison*, etc."

A proper distinction between open and closed syllables would have made this second statement unnecessary. Besides the last part of the sentence quoted is again inaccurate phonetically, for there is not phonetically a second *r* in *parry* any more than there is in *parent*. The inaccuracy is again due to such mixture of the scientific with the popular, as must tend to obscurity and confusion of ideas.

But we wish to consider especially another part of the chapter before us. It is a widespread superstition that English pronunciation, like its spelling, is wholly without the pale of empirical laws. There have been, therefore, few attempts to study present English as made up of words, not to be considered as individuals with little in common, but as belonging to categories in which certain sounds usually and naturally occur, because of a similar development under similar phonetic conditions. But this alone is the scientific method, and we propose to see if it is possible to state simply and intelligibly some of the empirical laws underlying present American speech.

In § 61 of the "Guide" we find this:

"A (one dot above). This is the sound to be preferred in certain words or syllables ending in *sh, ff, ft, th, ss, sp, st, nce, nt, nd*."

But *ss, sp, sk, st, ff, ft, th*, (voiceless must be

intended although it is not stated) are simply graphic representations of the voiceless fricatives with their possible consonant combinations. This part of the law may be stated in a simpler and more accurate form thus: this *a* appears in closed syllables before the voiceless fricatives *f*, *th*, and *s*. It must be understood of course that voiceless *f*, *th*, *s* refer to the sound by whatever graphic representation. We should expect, therefore, that *laugh*, *draught*, *calf*, *half*, etc., would have the same pronunciation, although the 'Dictionary' inclines to the *a* of *arm* in some of these cases. Let us next consider the *n*-combinations. If to those mentioned we add *ntf* (*nch*) and *ndʒ* (*nge*) we shall have all *n*-combinations before which *a* occurs. But *a* before *nge* (*ndʒ*) was long in Middle English, and hence appears now as *ē*, in *range*, *change*, etc. In many words this *a* occurs before *nch* (*ntf*) but not in all according to the pronunciation in the dictionary. Still it can hardly be doubted that the following statement is more nearly accurate than the one given, and its simplicity is evident. This *a* occurs in closed syllables before the voiceless fricatives *f*, *th*, and *s*, as well as before *n*+consonant, except *nge* (*ndʒ*).

In London English, we find that words with *a* before *r* final or *r*+consonant belong here. But according to the 'International,' Italian *a* (*a* with two dots above) occurs regularly before *r* final or *r*+consonant, and such would be a simpler statement of the relations of this vowel. It may be pointed out, however, that *ah*, the interjection, is a peculiarly bad example of this vowel, since its quantity, as well as its quality, to some extent differs with the different ideas conveyed: surprise, indignation, incredulity. The word *father* is also of value traditionally, but it does not represent any group of words having similar vowel and consonant combinations. Indeed most of the lists of examples would be improved if a larger number of simple, but typical, every-day words had been chosen.

Let us next take the open *o*-sound; as, of *a* in *all*, *o* in *fork*. Historically we have here *a* and *o* as shown by our spelling, and here may be seen the importance of recognizing historical development. An attempt to state this in more accurate form may be made in this way: older

short *a* (written *a*) has become open *o* before *l*, and, when preceded by *w*, before *r*+consonant. Examples are *all*, *tall*, *hall*, *haul*, *warm*, *swarm*, *quart*. As to whether *salt*, *malt* (§ 72) show a different sound, except as dialectic peculiarities, I have great doubts. The word *quarrel* cited in the same section belongs to a different category. For open *o* from earlier short *o*, the rule is that it appears regularly before *r* final, or *r*+consonant. In London English, open *o* also occurs before voiceless *f*, *th*, *s*, and it is questionable whether it is not so in most dialects of America. Examples are *for*, *or*, *fork*, *corn*, *horn*, *soft*, *cross*, *froth*. Apparent exceptions are the words with *o* that had been lengthened in Middle English; as, *torn*, *borne*, and those in which the *o* had been shortened after *w*; as, in *word*, *work*, *world*, *worm*, *worse*, *worth*.

The attempt to separate the long from the short open *o* is not all that might be desired, but some sections will admit of simpler statement (cf. § 113-124 and 70-74). Section 74 reads:

"*A* (one dot below) as in *was*, *what*, *wander*, *wallow*, *quality*, etc. The sound is identical, or at least nearly so, with that of *o* (odd, not) etc."

This should be stated, older *a* (written *a*) after *w* is short open *o*, which is without exception, since of course the *w*-influence accounts for the rounding of the *a*. With this should be combined a statement in regard to older *o* which is now short and open (*not*), to be separated from the older *o* before nasals which has now the sound of *u* in *up*. Examples are *son*, *ton*, *won*, *done*.

Attention should be called also to the fact that in America, open short *o* has become unrounded, appearing as *a* in the majority of cases. Mr. Grandgent found this true as far as his investigation went last year (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Feb., 1891). Professor Primer had already found it so for South Carolina (cf. *Amer. Jour. of Phil.*, ix, p. 206,) while it is so also in the pronunciation of the majority of educated Americans I meet. My own belief is that short open *o* is in America mainly a matter of tradition. It would be interesting to have a more thorough investigation of this sound. Incidentally a correction may be here made to a statement of § 61 in regard to these two sounds. It says:

"The two forms *Mahomet* and *Mohammed* have come to us through a confusion of the two vowel sounds [*ɔ* and *æ*]."

It needs only a slight acquaintance with language to know that this is a practical impossibility, the explanation not accounting for the difference between the vowels in the first syllables or between the final consonants *d* and *t*. Even the 'Dictionary' itself does not point out that the first is the older French form, while the last is a later word from the Arabic.

We may exemplify the reign of law by our *u* sounds. Of these, there are three, *u* (*up*), *u* (*full*), *ū* (*food*), each of which has a distinct historical development. Long *ū* is O.E. *ō*; or O.E. *ā* after *w*, cf. for the latter *oose*, *who*, *two*, *swoop*. Shortening has occurred in many words, especially before the dentals, producing the sound we have in *full*. The latter sound is also the development of original short *u* before *l*; compare *wolf*, *full*, *pull*, *bull*. The *u* of *up* is the regular descended of short *u*, except before *l*, and also of short *o* before *n*.

One other point must be mentioned even in this incomplete review of the chapter in question. The 'International' separates the *ē* of *her*, *fern*, *fir* from the sound in *urn* with this statement:

"The distinction of sounds here noted . . . is quite clear; and the majority of orthoëpists are in favor of observing it. It is at the same time true that, by the majority of English-speaking people, it is not actually observed." It is clear from this last admission, that the distinction here made is not one of 'standard' English as defined in § 21. It does not rest on use, but on what orthoëpists think should be the use. And yet the difference is so great that the 'International' calls the two 'narrow' and 'wide,' as great a distinction as is made between *ē* (*ale*) and *e* (*end*). It is needless to say that both the attempted distinctions and the disregard of good use, or standard English, are unscientific and unworthy a place in this new volume.

This article makes no attempt at being exhaustive in its treatment of the chapter in question. It does attempt to indicate some questionable points in its phonetics, and to show how essential to simplicity and accuracy is a knowledge of the historical development of the speech. Possibly also it may lead some

in this dictionary-loving America to place a little less faith in "authorities," and instead observe more accurately, and more in accordance with the scientific method.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

MIDDLE ENGLISH SYNTAX.

Streifzüge durch die mittellenglische Syntax unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprache Chaucer's von Dr. Eugen Eienkel —mit einem Wörterbuche von Wilhelm Grote. Münster I.W.: Heinrich Schöningh. 1887. 8vo, pp. xxii, 296.

UNDER this modest title Dr. Eienkel has collected a vast amount of material for a completer study of Middle English syntax, especially Chaucerian syntax. After an examination of the work the reader will surely agree with me that the title would have been more accurate had it been reversed and made to read: with occasional references to Middle English syntax. For, as Dr. Eienkel remarks in his preface, the study is based upon the 'syntax of Chaucer and his times.' And apart from literary value, there is another reason why the "well of English undefiled" should be made the head of this stream of research, namely, because that after the contact of Anglo-Saxon with Norman-French, beginning about the middle of the eleventh century, the new fusion reached a high degree of development in the fourteenth century.

'In the course of the fifteenth century,' Dr. Eienkel observes, 'the process of the development of the language becomes gradually slower, the obsolete becomes more and more forgotten, innovations are ventured upon only to a slight extent, and thought finds its proper setting with greater security. This same was still truer of the sixteenth century.'

Dr. Eienkel's method is generally to retrace the Chaucerian syntax to the Anglo-Saxon or Old French origin. No attempt has been made to cite the employment of the same form in successive periods or stages of development of the language, unless the proofs of antiquity are insufficient. This precludes, naturally, any regard of phonology or inflection, thus making it a work supplementary to

Prof. ten Brink's 'Chaucers Sprache und Verskunst.'

In order of discussion the Substantive and the Article appear first, being followed by chapters on the Adjective and the Article, the Cases—accusative, nominative, genitive, dative,—the Prepositions, and finally the Verb.

The results of the author's examination of the absolute accusative and nominative construction with participle are noteworthy, because they verify for a later period of English what Dr. Callaway (*Am. Jour. of Phil.*, Vol. x) has done for the Anglo-Saxon. The latter investigator concludes as follows:

"The absolute participle of the Anglo-Saxon was borrowed from the Latin, but it failed to commend itself to our forefathers and never acquired a real hold in their language."

Dr. Einkenkel also finds that the Middle English nominative absolute corresponds generally to the Latin ablative absolute and, like the latter, is used to denote various relations. Whether the French accusative construction is to be classed here remains still a question.

In the chapter on gender of nouns (p. 42) the author says that Chaucer uses *sonne* once as feminine. I differ in the reading of the line which causes this exception:

"But right as floures . . .
Redressen hem ayein the sonne brighte,
And spreden on hire kynde cours by rowe." iv, 192.

This is a translation of Dante's:

"Qual' i fioretti . . .
. . . poi che'l sol gl'imbianca,
Si drizzan tutti aperti in loro stelo." 'Inf.' ii, l. 127.

Thus "on hire kynde cours by rowe" means in their natural order in line, a paraphrase of "in loro stelo," and "hire" does not refer to the "sonne," but to "floures."

In the explanation of *fourtenyght* and *twelve moneth* (p. 43) it should have been stated that in Anglo-saxon both *niht* and *monað* have the singular form for the plural, and that their appearance in Middle English is only a continuation of this historic use. Moreover with the *seofon niht*, 'Blick. Hom.,' 45, 39: or 'Beow.' 517, compare Chaucer's phrase "she was seven night old," 'Nonne P.' l. 53.

Certainly the case of *wayte* (p. 48) is not simplified by making it assume an unknown meaning, namely, *deny*. The Bell edition suggests *wayte*=French *tenez*: 'hold'! which makes good sense.

In the next paragraph (p. 48) the passage reading "*In lokynge of*" is quoted from the 'Parl. of Foules' l. 110, not from the 'Leg. of Goode W.,' as printed. And even here *lokynge*, despite the *of* with its accompanying genitive, is used in place of a transitive verb, showing that the Italian model had distorted the poet's English use of the word. This line is also a paraphrase of Dante's "cercar lo tuo volume" ('Inf.' i, l. 83).

The whole difficulty encountered (p. 49) in the verse "Where lay the shippe that Jason gan arryve" (v, 332) the only case of a transitive use of *arryve* in Chaucer's poetry, is removed by the reading given in Mr. Skeat's edition: "Wher that the ship of Iasoun gan aryve," l. 1472. And a note upon the same states: "So Cr. T. A; F. Tn. Th. B. Wher lay the shippe, that Iasoun (*giving no sense*)."

It may be said at this point that Dr. Einkenkel has supplied the reader with almost seven pages of works and books of reference, but that the valuable editions of Mr. Skeat are conspicuously absent. Many of the latter's excellent criticisms would have lightened Einkenkel's task, and certainly would have spared him not a few mistakes.

The preposition is far more difficult. More than one third of the book is reserved for the examination of this little, endlessly varying part of speech which expresses the relation of a noun to its governing word. These prepositional joints were sorely tried during the so-called transition period of Middle English, that process of change from a synthetic to an analytic tongue. Some Old English prepositions continued stationary in meaning, some acquired new significations, these at times representing French equivalents.

The examiner's list of examples is extensive yet far from being exhaustive, for the preposition, is protean in form. It is possible to offer other interpretation for the following p. 116: *at poynt devys* (v, 237)="an einem gegebenen, gewissen, Punkte, irgendwo(?)," which Mr. Skeat defines *with great exactitude*; p. 123: *Have at the* (v, 319)="achte auf dich, hüte dich," also given by Mr. Skeat as *let me attack (or pursue) thee*, a hunting phrase; p. 136: *for anything* (ii, 9)="um irgend etwas, um alles," with which compare Mr. Skeat's note *for fear of anything*; p. 141: *for blak, for old* (ii, 66), are put among the causal of

for, but are explained by Mr. Skeat as intensive=*very black, very old*: p. 141: causal *for*, the writer states, is used once "for our *gegenwider*," but compare 'Parl. of Foules,' ll. 468, 657, *for tarying*=to prevent (against) tarrying; p. 167: *sayne of* does occur 'Leg. of Goode W.' l. 130 "of the seson fayn"; p. 198: an exact Old English correspondence to *ayein the sonne* denoting rest in location may be found in 'Battle of Maldon,' l. 100, *ongean gramum stodon*; p. 109: *to* can be said to denote simple purpose in 'Dan.,' l. 88, *pær fundon to*, *pær* being used for the dem. prn. neut.; *to* in Old English is often employed to express degree, proportion, when united to *pon*. Compare 'Beow.,' l. 1877, "*was him se man to pon leof pæt*"; p. 221: *thurgh* certainly signifies *vermittels* in 'Prior. T,' l. 1669, *thurgh thy preyere*; p. 224: Old English *wið* is sometimes used with verbs of motion, note 'B. of Maldon,' ll. 7-8, *fleogan wið* which may go to interpret *with him* (iv, 249)=*at his house*; p. 226: *wið* can have not a hostile meaning in 'W. of Fal.,' l. 1066, "*biloved weþ riche & pore*"=beloved by rich and poor.

Dr. Einkenel's treatise must be regarded as a valuable contribution to the understanding of a most obscure period in the history of the syntax of Middle English. Many such laborious, accurate compilations are necessary as forerunners to future history of English grammar.

It is to be regretted that the book has not been more carefully made up, the topics distinctly separated by numbered sections. Nor is Mr. Grote's glossarial index complete enough to enable one to refer readily to special discussions.

CHARLES FLINT MCCLUMPHA.

University of the City of New York.

GERMAN BALLADS AND FRENCH LYRICS.

Balladen und Romanzen: Selected and arranged with Notes and Literary Introduction by C. A. Buchheim, Ph. D., Professor of German Literature in King's College; London Editor of "Deutsche Lyrik," London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1891.

Introduction to Modern French Lyrics. Edited with notes by B. L. Bowen, Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Romance Languages in Ohio State University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1891.

To paraphrase Rousseau's famous *mot* on Plato's pedagogy: "Would you get an idea of the education of a country? Examine its text-books." For such an examination the pessimistic point of view as regards our own status is the preferable one. Nothing will so strongly and clearly bring out the shortcomings and limitations of our teaching, especially in the branch, Modern Languages—which at present still requires internal "push" and external and united aggressiveness,—as a comparison with the requirements of other countries in quantity and quality and the facilities furnished for mastering them. The period of progress heralded a few years since, has prolonged itself into the present and is permanent for the future. So that any criticism of new work partakes much of the spirit of Blanc's splendid pen-picture of the state of the French people before the Revolution: a dark past, shot here and there with a few gleams of light: a desire for the good in other nations; and then the full flood of the risen sun.

We are led to these remarks by a few volumes of the Autumn store of new or renewed books for class use, which present some points of interest. Calculating merely on a basis of averages, we find that the Modern Language courses of English schools are far beyond that of our colleges and universities, and equalled, or nearly so, by only a few of our superior schools. Almost any English grammar or text-book will show what the scholar or student is expected to master, a task much beyond the present abilities, even subtracting for the difference in time allowed here and there, of the learner. The low plane of requirement in American colleges as to either entrance or subsequent work, is the most dangerous recoil to classicism. The lovers of the latter who live across the line in the country of the contemporaneous, but built on the same historic soil, nourishing similar roots, desire, by a more equal division of the "spoils" of time, to avoid the day of much

crippling to classicism which modern needs and demands, not now satisfied, will be sure to cause unless harmonious adjustment is arranged. The best proofs of these propositions—the superiority of foreign work-in-the-school, the possibilities of the full union of classical culture and modern-language scholarship, the steady approach in America to an independent ideal, an approach to be hastened by the reflex influence of non-American work, are well seen in the books we have referred to.

Although destined for a text-book as well, Professor Buchheim's 'Balladen und Romanzen' is rather an exquisite contribution to literature, worthy of its numerous predecessors and companions in that series which so well deserves its name of golden. He has redeemed his promise given in 'Deutsche Lyrik,' and has made a collection which surpasses the latter in general interest, in so far as the appeal of Ballad, Romance, or *Volklied* is to a wider audience than that of the Lyric, which demands more the evolution of instinctive and poetic feeling, or literary culture, for its appreciation. And, again, the systematic sequence, we may be allowed to maintain, in the present collection is preferable to the "systematic variation" which the editor made one of the strong points of the *Lyrik* compilation. Professor Buchheim has every qualification for the task of editorship. He has selective skill, the Teutonic talents of sterling scholarship and critical acumen, frank admiration for his national poetry, and an equally frank appreciation of the merits of English song, which would make him as good and impartial a critic as Swinburne (if we can call Swinburne impartial *in re* Hugo) in his contrast of Tennysonian "anti-Gallican" antipathies and Hugo-cosmopolitanism. Still further, evidenced both by the trend of many selections and the exegesis in the vivid and scientific notes, we find those classical leanings which we have referred to as the true basis of all modern-language study. Add a really remarkably fine English style, and a poetic touch which appear in phrases like:

"The ballad as such had before been considered as the Cinderella of literature, it now became gradually 'the favorite child of poetry'"; or this, of Heine;

"He winds up the most delicate poetical sentiments with a satirical hit; thus combining the sweet notes of the nightingale with the jeering tones of the mocking-bird"; and we are not surprised at an independent contribution to critical literature in his "Introduction", or a literary volume from the editor's hands. In this introduction, the historic heredity of the ballad is well treated, and its connection with kindred forms in other languages; its differentiation from other resembling types is also clearly stated; its components—the narrative, or epic factor, and the dramatic, both sometimes merging into the lyrical; its elements—"dignified, though popular language, dramatic movement, and nobleness of conception"; and its classification into historical, traditional and artistic, are all carefully, if succinctly treated. The three periods—from Bürger to Chamisso, from Uhland to Heine, and from Freiligrath to the present, are characterized and admirably illustrated and the dominant note of the various authors explained. Since, in his "Preface" we are told of the reasons and regret for the omission of many other ballads, it is idle and not necessary to complain at the absence of a chance one. But it is with certain statements that we would stop, for either criticism or suggestion. We are told (p. xxi) that "The Germans have at all times been catholic in their literary tastes", a point, supported by appeal to the period of imitation of Italian and French models, and the Göttingen coterie and their work on English bases. Reference might have also been made, *en passant*, to the Spanish influence. But the very examples adduced tell against the generalization. We can not enter into a discussion which would lead us beyond the scope of the present outline into a defence of a contrary doctrine, but from whichever side we look at the assertion, we seem forced to subtract from its breadth, explainable and pardonable by Professor Buchheim's own sympathetic appreciation with the literature of other countries, and love of that of his own tongue, by birth or heredity. For catholicity as a continual presence can in no sense be predicated of German literature. As compared with France, Germany does not offer the spectacle of a similar unbroken literary continuity. Catholicity implies comprehensive-

ness of view; comprehensiveness is based on comparison, and comparison demands an indigenous standard, which in the turmoils of German history, the differentiation of provinces, and the confusion of dialects, Teutonism could not consistently provide. Again, the appreciation, great and genuine and far-reaching in its effects as it was, was yet limited to certain portions of the country—however much they crystallized and were centres of German literature—and that, too, in a late period of the literary history. If we analyze still further, we may sum up the data thus:—it implies a false theory to qualify appreciation of foreign work when itself dependent for existence on lack of native opportunity for criticism, as comprehensive and generous acceptance of foreign talent. When Gottsched set the standard of French shape and sentiment, but failed to understand the power of English production, he doubly illustrated the tendency of the lack of already-manufactured material at home, and a conception of criticism far from catholic. If, on the other hand, Frederick the Great, unlike his predecessor, adopted French as the vehicle of his thought, vied with Voltaire in the domain of historical writing and cherished the culture of an alien tongue, he did it at the expense and not as the complement of a language of which he was personally ignorant, and which he publicly crushed with contempt—a historical truth which even Geibel's ballad (105 of this collection),—with its story of the king's *Sehnsucht* for a native literature he refused to acknowledge when present around him,—will scarcely refute. Still more important, we must not forget that Haller—who preferred home to honors; that Bodmer, Breitinger and the Zürich school, whose glory is their championship of English excellence, while fully appreciating their own style, were themselves foreigners in fact, though Teutonic in every affinity. Again, remembering that Lessing, Herder, Goethe and the lyric copyists, appeared only in the latest periods and fought hard to inculcate a wide appreciation of the foreign; that feeling had so much change that German literary sentiment, whether based on incorporated French, or native models, was at first shocked at 'Götz' and later, after a long period of

education and culture, received 'Iphigenia' "coldly," also as non-German, and that, a century before, Molière had been pushed aside for the broad and low farce which still survived until the 'Minna,' and we think the case a pretty strong one as against the general appreciation, in either time or extent, of German literature for foreign influence per se.

On p. xxiii, after dating the birth of the modern ballad from Bürger's "Lenore," and stating that,

"It would be beyond the extent of this introductory sketch to show the inspiring influence Bürger's marvellous ballad exercised in (England) and other countries outside Germany,"

a few words are given to the "affinity between German and English poetry." It seems as if some expansion, not of the effects, but of the causes were here desirable. Even for the educated readers for whom the volume is destined, a few lines of clear statement such as Professor Buchheim can so admirably furnish, would not be out of point. The reasons for racial affinity as reflected in both literatures would add to the argument. Schlegel's theory that climate conditions character, and that the grand in the physical world often finds the gruesome in the mental one as its complement, would make clear the intellectual substratum of Scandinavian and Saxon literatures.

It is, however, the defence of Heine which offers much interest. Even later German criticism cannot be fully just to the memory and work of the one whose brilliant pages still touch with their sarcastic thrust some of the sore spots of German nationality and literature. Heine's religious feelings have not had their full due. His revolt against creed and cant, scandalously expressed as it often was, did not obscure cardinal principles of belief, which, feeling the contrast of his own life and his apostasy with them, he took his usual ironical pleasure in suppressing and changing into their contraries. If we read Heine carefully in numberless passages; if, as Professor Buchheim takes pleasure in showing, we can so easily find in his poems and notes, that "in spite of his scepticism, Heine possessed a mind imbued with" "a deep religious feeling"; if we read the beautiful and Heinesquely-simple declaration in his will, we will do justice to the

man, enjoy the matter more, and find a creed far more explicit than the Deism of Hugo, and more akin to the dying declarations of Napoleon, with a personal element added, but also at times, the same spirit of badinage.

The notes are full, varied, historical mainly, and most interesting. Commenting on xvi, Goethe's "Der Zauberlehrling," a reference is made to its possible connection with the idea of the French Revolution. It appeared in the *Musenalmannich* of 1798. That Goethe, who had just finished (June, 1797) his 'Hermann und Dorothea,' and still imbued with the ideas he had there treated, should have made use of them in a new channel, is most probable. But the ballad may possibly have a wider significance, and link itself directly with that sympathy with the spiritual world which was at all times Goethe's delight, and found expression in two such widely divergent manifestations as the *Hexenküche* of Faust (to which this ballad bears several interesting affinities) and the "Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele."

In considering the ballads of the last or modern period, we find a good proof that poetic power has not yet perished in the nation and a hopeful prophecy for the future.

Some other minor points we pass over, but we suggest the following: that (p. xxiii), Dr. Johnson's "well-known squib" be inserted in the text; and that (p. xxix), referring to Professor Dowden's edition of 'Lyrical Ballads,' the note be made a little more explicit. We suggest, also, that the note to cviii, be slightly amplified, by a reference to some of the other stories on the same theme, such as Morris' "Hill of Venus." And, in cxx, would it not be eminently appropriate, particularly in this volume, to mention the charming little episode at Goslar, immortalized by Heine, which we would fain have had him crystallize in poetry as well as prose.

Professor Buchheim is scarcely (see Preface) responsible for typographical slips in the Notes, but we notice a few points which we beg to submit as inadvertences (the only ones) of his style: p. xxxv, "and they *only* wrote ballads occasionally," for "only occasionally," and Notes, on lix, p. 310, "but has not *got* there in such disrepute"; we object to "*got* in such disrepute." Lastly, the following errors

for correction in subsequent editions: p. xxix, line 8, either "these requirements" or "this requirement" for "this requirements"; p. xxxiv, l. 21, "uniformity": p. 305—note, "See p. 112," should read "212"; p. 311, l. 1, "i" omitted in "traditional"; tenth line from bottom, "e" in Grafensprung inverted; fourth from bottom "Cp. No. cxx, p. 191," should be "291"; p. 314, "p. 292, No. cxx" should be "p. 291." Finally, p. 306, the second reference (last line) to 'Le Roman de Rou' is wrong. I have at command only Andresen's edition (Heilbroun, 1877, 1879) whose lineation is different, and cannot locate the exact correspondence, but call attention to the mistake in the number.¹

When we look at Buchheim and Fasnacht, Lange and Naf, when we see in the former the list of subjects which candidates are able to explain in the original, and compare our own results, we think a jeremiad quite in order. But we have said that American scholarship is keeping pace with the demands of extended opportunities and recognition. To the list of books for which we are indebted to those American educational Macmillans—Messrs. D. C. Heath and Co.—we add Professor Bowen's 'Introduction to Modern French Lyrics,' a collection divided into National and Revolutionary Songs, and groups from Béranger, Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Alfred de Musset, Théophile Gautier and Miscellaneous Poems. The editor of any collection may avoid criticism by falling back on Swinburne's critique of Hugo, and claiming

"That when I venture to select for special mention any special poem, I do not dream of venturing to suggest that others are not or may not be fully as worthy of homage."

Yet when we think of the *Châtiment*, the *Chansons des Rues et des Bois*, the *Contemplations*, and the *Légende des Siècles*, with their glorious gamut of powerful passion and pathos, through every range from stinging satire to most simple sweetness, we cannot but confess to a spirit of irritation at the attempt at limitation—the sampling—a broken splinter,

¹ Could not the publishers be induced to return to the old models, instead of substituting the present seal on the cover, "G. T. S." and a slightly different style, which take away a little from what is otherwise perfect book-making?

beautiful though it is in itself, from the monument of grandeur and glory refulgent from the genius which illuminates it. The selection for the space is, however, very harmonious, and with the addition of, perhaps, a few more extracts to illustrate two points scarcely brought out sufficiently in the choice: the tremendous force and overwhelming impetus of Hugo's verse, or the exquisite, *oiseau-muche* delicacy of touch in his lighter lyrics,—the extracts will be fairly representative.

So, of the Béranger poems. Béranger is essentially the poet of bonhomie and Bohemianism; of the poor but good-natured, as well as of the patriotic populace. We miss enough stress on that note. The proportion of the grave to the gay, we may say of the serious political to the enthusiastic political and the *insouciant* philosophy of poverty and pleasure pictured by the poet, is too great. The National and Revolutionary songs form an admirable set. The other authors are well represented, but in the Miscellaneous portion, even if by its date (in spite of its survival as a modern song) we cannot include the "Malbrough s'en-va-ten guerre," that poem of nursery and proverb so incorporate in the language, certainly the "Partant pour la Syrie," both modern and universal, could there find a place. We cannot but express these thoughts which occur to us. But it is less in criticism than for the further perfecting of a work in conception and execution so agreeable. Here again, we find a due mingling of the scientific side and the literary, the indebtedness to the classical basis being emphasized and illustrated. Preceding the Notes are clear and compact remarks on French versification, serving as an introduction to the comprehension of the Alexandrine. The Notes themselves are full, without being wearisome, the introductory notices of authors and poems being exceedingly good. Two noticeably good points in the philological references are the giving of the accusative instead of nominative case, and the distinction of Low-Latin forms by the asterisk.

We would suggest that, in note on line 6, par. 2 (p. 149), or on page 6, l. 8 (p. 150), the full rule as to the *s* (*sc*, *sp*, *st*, in general terms) and initial *e* be stated, especially as other

philological principles are defined at some length. To the interpretation of p. 6, l. 15 (on p. 150) we might be disposed to object. We think the exegesis must depend on the shading and that, in this case, *flancs* is less likely to mean *sein*. "We shall bear, i. e. carry, your avengers on our breasts," brings up the pictures of babes borne on the bosom. But if "avengers," why mention of "babes."? If we translate the idea to mean "we shall bear, i. e. beget, avengers," we have a meaning more in consonance with the thought. This use of *flanc* and *porter* is a common one. We might refer—as to the idea—to the famous story of Italian history. But Professor Bowen's own note, p. 174, on 69.8, "Qui porte un éclair au flanc," as "within it" is corroborative. With the remarks that "to be hard up" (l. 17.8, p. 156) is slightly 'slangy' as a translation, especially as an equivalent for the *style soutenu* of "être aux abois"; that (p. 170), on page 56, l. 24, the apostrophe after *que's* as a plural may mislead the student, and that the editor indulges a little freely in asyndeton, and we can but thank him for a delightful, original and scholarly addition to our texts of the highest class.

A. GUYOT CAMERON.

Yale University.

FRENCH HISTORY.

Readings from French History, edited by O.

B. SUPER, Ph. D. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1891. V+320.

It is always a pleasure to note the appearance of a good book, and that Prof. Super has given us such an one under the above caption no body will be disposed to question. While engaged in its perusal, the thought frequently occurred to the writer, how much better it would be if we more often put such books into the hands of French students, instead of the lighter species of literature, which, tho' showing what delightful story-tellers the French are, serve chiefly as amusement even when fully appreciated, which is not always the case. By adopting such a course as here proposed by Dr. Super, the double advantage is gained of introducing the student to one of the best species of French of the nineteenth century,

while at the same time he becomes acquainted with some of the most stirring and interesting episodes of history.

The selections given are from such authors as Thierry, "Conquête de l'Angleterre"; Barante, "Jeanne Darc"; L. Blanc, "Situation du peuple avant la Révolution"; Michelet, "Prise de la Bastille"; Lamartine, "Discours de Vergniaud"; Mignet, "Chute de Robespierre"; Lanfréy, "Le décret de Berlin et l'entrevue de Tilsit"; Ségur, "Napoléon à Moscou"; Thiers, "Napoléon à Sainte-Hélène"; Guizot, "Histoire de la civilisation en Europe, Leçon viii."

With the exception of the last (which is a little too abstract to be understood by young minds, unless they have a wider acquaintance with history than we have a right to assume in them) all the above will prove very attractive reading to any but the dullest students, whom it is usually impossible to interest in any thing.

The notes are meagre, but seem to be sufficient for a proper understanding of the text. The book is attractive in appearance and is singularly free from misprints for a first edition, only about half a dozen unimportant ones having been discovered after a careful reading.

SAMUEL GARNER.

U. S. Naval Academy.

CORRESPONDENCE.

JUDAISM IN EARLY ENGLAND.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Professor Cook, in his attempt to prove for the name Cædmon a biblico-Jewish origin, goes altogether too far, I think, in the December number of the NOTES. As to the name, the burden of evidence points to a Celtic origin, see especially Wülker in the *Anglia Mittheilungen*, Nov. 1891. But this is not the point that I would now discuss; rather Professor Cook's inference of specifically Jewish culture and tendencies in seventh-century Ireland, the inference being drawn from Todd's 'Life of St. Patrick,' p. 110. Such deductions were so contrary to all my previous understanding of early Irish affairs that I was, at first reading, completely puzzled. On turning to Todd's volume, however, I read that he

himself rejects emphatically the conclusions that Professor Cook now adopts. His language is explicit:

"It is not possible to believe that any great number of the Irish people in the seventh century could have gone over to Judaism; but these words [viz. *plerisque ad Judaismum se conferentibus*, in a Life of St. Disibod by the Abbess Hildegard, of the twelfth century] are a curious commentary on the whole passage, and enable us to estimate the value of such language. In the middle of the twelfth century, controversies between Christians and learned Jews were very common on the Continent of Europe; and Hildegardis, wishing to describe the most schismatical state of things in Ireland which she could conceive, may very naturally have adopted the idea and language of her own time and country [Germany], and assumed that a large number of the Irish people became converts to Judaism. This mistake, however, ought not to invalidate her testimony to the fact, confirmed as it is by native authorities, that the Irish church in the sixth and seventh centuries had in a great degree corrupted the faith."

Das also war des Pudels Kern!

A pious, narrow-minded German abbess of the twelfth century, writing the life of an Irishman of the seventh century, heard vague rumors of the unorthodoxy of the wild Irish of those days. Unorthodoxy of the twelfth century meant Judaism, ergo, etc., etc.

Nor is this all, Todd's 'Patrick' was written thirty years ago, being published 1864. Celtic philology has made great strides in that time. Todd's conclusion "that the Irish church in the sixth and seventh centuries had in a great degree corrupted the faith" is no longer tenable. On the contrary, the Irish church of that period was at its very highest and noblest. For it was out of *this* church that issued such world-renowned missionaries as Columba, Columban, Gallus, Aedan. At the time when the old British and Gaulish churches were knocked to pieces by their Germanic conquerors, when the church in Germany scarcely existed at all, and even the church in Italy was on the verge of decrepitude, the lamp of true Christian Culture burned brightest in Ireland. It is no exaggeration to say that the downfallen Christianity of central and western Europe was set up again and held up by Irish missionaries. Those who wish for particulars need only read Zimmer's memorable article in the *Preussische*

Jahrbücher, January 1887, translated by Mrs. Jane Loring Edmunds, under the title: 'The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture' (N. Y. Putnam's, 1891). In the *essentials* of Christianity the Irish of the seventh century were purer than any of their contemporaries. But their faith and ritual had come to them from the apostolic church through early Gaul, before the church of Rome had ever begun to establish its supremacy. Irish observances differed slightly from Roman. The Irish tonsure was not the same. Also the Irish Easter-cycle was the old Jewish-Christian, and not the new Roman. Upon these two points turned the whole controversy of a later time between the Roman missionaries and the Irish. See Bede's *Historia*, Book iii, ch. 25, 26; v. ch. 15. When finally the Irish church gave up its opposition and was merged in the general Roman Catholic Church, accepting all its rites and ceremonies, then it became the fashion to libel the early Irish recalcitrants as heretics or what not. And because their Easter-cycle had been the Jewish cycle, it became part of the fashion to tax the Irish church with Judaism. As if the contemporaries of Columban had had time for such backsliding! Warren, in his 'Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church,' pp. 9-46, examines one by one the imputations of heresy against the early Irish church and shows their groundlessness.

In truth the entire Disibod story seems to me mythical. Zimmer does not mention him among the great Irishmen. Disibod is scarcely an Irish name; the termination *-bod* has a Teutonic ring. Even the form Disen is questionable Irish. And could there have been an abbey of Disenberg in the diocese of Menz early in the seventh century? To me the story reads like an attempt to explain the Disenberg (or Disenburg) foundation by inventing an eponymous hero, akin to the story of Port and his two sons in the English Chronicle, anno 501.

Pardon the length of these remarks, in view of the general bearings of the question. We shall never, it seems to me, arrive at any clear understanding of the early middle ages unless we throw overboard every page of the later chronicles and *vitæ sanctorum* and insist upon contemporary evidence. Nor shall we

ever do justice to early Ireland unless we take Columban and his school for just what they were and did, and not for what their detractors made them out to be. There was in the early Irish church undoubtedly much that was crude, much that is repugnant to our nineteenth century notions. But all that was the remnant of the paganism that even St. Patrick tried in vain to eradicate. With the doctrines of Judaism it had nothing in common.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

AN ARTIFICIAL VOWEL-ROUNDER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Every unrounded vowel sound is supposed to have a corresponding rounded sound. The French *u* of *lune*, for example, is said to be nothing but the round form of the French *i* in *si*. By this is meant, that the tongue for the *u* is in the same position as for the *i*, but that the lips, which in *i* were "open," have in *u* been drawn together till only a small opening remains. If, then, one could bring the lips into the round position without changing the tongue-position of *i*, one could produce the more difficult *u* sound. But just here lies the difficulty. Very few can, like Sievers, accomplish this feat.

If, now, we take an oval piece of pasteboard with a hole in it the size of the lip-opening, and place it firmly against the lips while we are pronouncing the clear *i* of *si*, the resultant sound, escaping through the hole in the pasteboard, should be the *u* of *lune*, or at least a fair approximation to that sound. The piece of pasteboard should be large enough to lap over the lips at all points, and should be bent to suit the contour of the mouth. A more pleasant material is, of course, glass. A glass rounder may easily be obtained by having an oval piece cut from the side of any clear glass cylinder, tumbler, or bottle. The cylinder should be from two to three inches in diameter, to give the right curve to the plate. As I shall try to show later, a clear glass rounder of this kind is useful in other and perhaps more important ways.

It is evident, however, that if such a rounder

succeeds in developing round from unround vowels, it should work the other way also. That is, one who did not know the vowel of *si*, but knew that of *lune*, should be able to derive the *i* from the *u*. The method would be this: let him first fix his lips as for an ordinary open vowel, then let him put the plate against them, and produce the known *u*-sound. On taking away the plate, the sound should be that of *i* in *si*, for the tongue remains in the *u*-position which, if phoneticians are right, is also the *i*-position, and the lips have all the time remained "open." To take another and better example: one unacquainted with the high-back of Gaelic *laogh*, ought to be able to derive it, if he knows the high-back-round of French *ou*. For, by producing *ou* through the rounder, and by then taking the rounder away during the production of voice, there should be an instant change to high-back. The whole matter rests on the temporary substitution of a plate for the lips, and the idea is so simple that no further description is necessary.

If it be true that we can thus derive an unknown from a known vowel, the fact is evidently of some value; for wherever a language has a round vowel and not its open mate, or the open vowel and not the round mate, it would be possible for one who knew the sounds of that language to discover, at least with considerable accuracy, the unknown sound. A glance at any vowel table will show at once in how many cases this would be valuable. The number of these cases is largely increased for a person who has learned two or three of the simpler vowels of a foreign language, such, for an English-speaking person, as *i* and *ou* of French, and *ö* of German. It is usually unsafe to experiment on foreign sounds, yet these simpler vowels may be thoroughly mastered and may then serve as a basis for the production of others.

To determine whether such a rounder has any practical value in the acquirement of new sounds, I have been trying it with my beginning classes in French. It is perhaps too early to speak definitely, but certainly a large per cent of my pupils have either the French *u* or a close approximation to it. It would of course be absurd to claim that the rounder can do any more than to teach the ear how the *u*, or

unknown vowel, sounds, but even that would be a great deal, for it is there the student must begin. The rounder is an attempt to provide him a model which he may consult as often as he wishes. Aside from any value in and of itself, such a mechanical contrivance, especially if made by the student, would serve to fix his attention more particularly on pronunciation. I shall be very glad to know the results of any attempts to use the rounder as an aid to pronunciation.

I have said that a glass plate such as is described has other, and perhaps more important uses than those just mentioned. It is clear that with such a plate, we can pronounce *ö*, *ou*, the *u* of *foot*, or indeed any round vowel, with the lips in the open position. This means that with good light and a mirror, we can, by means of such a glass plate, see the tongue in these round vowels, a thing which, I believe, has hitherto been impossible. The slightest quivering or change of the tongue in passing from one of these vowels to another, may be clearly noted. The consonants also offer a good field for examination, especially the lip-stop consonants, *p* and *b*, the lip-nasal *m*, and the so-called lip-back, *wh* and *w*.

I may add that the rounders which I have were made by David Walsh, Union Glass Works, Somerville, Mass., but a short distance from Harvard University, where the rounder was first used. Mr. Walsh is an exceedingly careful and intelligent workman, and for experimental apparatus in glass, is one of the best in America.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

University of Michigan.

Hutchels.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the *Proceedings* of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, 1890, p. xviii, mention is made of the word *hutchels*, used in East Tennessee to denote 'dried peaches.' It is mentioned there as a 'dialectic survival of Older English.' But what is that older form of the word? If none were to be found, may the term not be explained as a German loan-word, lately introduced into East Tennessee English? There is, in German, the

verb *hutzeln*, meaning 'to dry fruit' [*Obst-dörren*], particularly pears and plums. Figuratively, it is also used in the intransitive sense of *zusammenschrumpfen*. The compound *einholzeln* occurs; for example, in Burger's famous ballad 'Der Kaiser und der Abt':

"Wie hotzelt Ihr ein!
Mein Sixchen! es muss euch 'was angethan sein'!"

The substantive *hutzeln*, fem., plur. *hutzeln*, means 'gedörrtes obst.'

EMIL HAUSKNECHT.

Berlin.

CHAUCER'S PROLOQUE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Mit Rücksicht auf Herrn Tweedies Bemerkung (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vi, 218) zu v. 400 des Prologs der 'C. T.' erlaube ich mir an *Anglia* 1, 478 zu erinnern, wo ich die Stelle längst so erklärt habe, wie es jetzt auch Skeat thut.

J. ZUPITZA.

Berlin.

SCHILLER TRANSLATION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I am surprised to see (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vi, page 438) that Buchheim's translation of Schiller's *wirf es entschlossen hin nach deiner Krone* ('Jungfrau von Orleans,' i, 4), "for the benefit of thy crown," should be objected to. 'Nach' here denotes the aim at which everything Karl has, is to be thrown. "Thy crown is at stake, in order to secure it"—says Sorel to Karl: "aim at it with everything thou hast," "throw at it everything thou hast," "give up everything . . . for the benefit of thy crown."

EMIL HAUSKNECHT.

Berlin.

A SUGGESTION IN PROVENÇAL LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG NOTES.

SIRS:—A slight error in connection with the penitential song of William IX of Poitiers deserves correction. This song, which is the fourth of the selections from this poet given by Bartsch in his 'Chrestomathie provençale,' closes with the words;

"Aissi guerpisc joi e deport
e vair' e gris e sembeli."

The vocabulary defines *gris*, with a reference to this passage, *grau*. In Diez' 'Leben und Werke der Troubadours,' there is also the following translation:

"Und hiermit geb'ich Freud und Scherz
Und Bunt und Grau und Zobel auf."

It is easy to understand that the author should abandon bright colors, but why should he say adieu to grey? Does not the word rather signify an expensive fur? Chaucer, describing the finery of his Monk, says ("Prologue," 193-4):

"I saugh his sleeves purfled atte hounde
With grys, and that the fyneste of a loud."

In connection with this passage, see the note in Morris' Edition of the "Prologue, etc." (Clarendon Press Series) particularly two references to the 'Roman de la Rose,' line 9417;

"Et de vair et de gris la forre,"

and lines 9602-3;

"Et commandés que l'eu vous veste
De camelot, de vair, de gris."

LEWIS F. MOTT.

College of the City of New York.

Dove FOR Dived.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In answer to Professor Stockley's query in the December number of MOD. LANG. NOTES (vi, p. 252) I can say that my experience goes to show that the use of *dove* for *dived* is not confined to any particular part of the United States. It is quite common in this section of the country; and I once heard an instructor in an eastern university say, "He *dove* under." In Iowa I have never heard *wove* as the past tense of *wave*.

In this connection it will not be out of place to say that the verb *enthuse*, especially in the past participle or adjective form *enthused* (*enthusiastic*), is surprisingly common in Iowa City, even among educated people. It would be interesting to learn how extensively this word is employed in other places. I do not remember to have heard it in the East.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

State University of Iowa.

BRIEF MENTION.

'The Study of English Literature: A plea for its recognition and organization at the Universities,' by John Churton Collins (Macmillan & Co.), is a book that for several reasons deserves attention. Though it is largely a reproduction, compressed in some parts, elaborated in other parts, of well known articles contributed by the author to the Modern Language controversy at Oxford and Cambridge, there is naturally a gain in the systematic arrangement of the argument and in coherence and development of plan, that gives to the volume a special value. By confession there is still much in these pages of a polemical spirit,—in this instance perhaps a pardonable blemish, it is at least conceivable that under more peaceful conditions Mr. Collins might have written less earnestly. As the title suggests the plea is for the establishment, at the University centres, of organized instruction in English Literature,—in Literature "rescued from its present degrading vassalage to Philology." It is then shown that English Literature and "the higher criticism" are "susceptible of systematic and accurate study," and there is a triumphant winnowing of the wheat of Literature from the chaff of Philology. The next proposition,

"that the history of English Literature can never be studied properly unless it be studied in connection with the Literatures of Greece and Rome, and that to study it without reference to those Literatures is as absurd as it would be to study the history of Ethics and Metaphysics or the history of Sculpture and Architecture without reference to the ancient Schools," evokes much sound reasoning and betrays a breadth of view and an appreciation of scientific and historic methods of study which the persistent flings at Philology would seem to contradict. Upon this comprehensive basis of the derivation of English Literature there is set up a proposed "Constitution of a School of Literature," "its central and chief subject" being English Literature, intimately associated with ancient Classical Literature and less "minutely and systematically" embracing the Literatures of Italy, France and Germany. A tabular view is added of what Mr. Collins would require, in whole or part, of a candidate for "Honors" in a "School of Literature

worthy of our Universities." Although the book is addressed to the special conditions of the English Universities, it is worthy of careful consideration in America. There is richness of suggestion and sanity of pedagogical doctrine that cannot fail to stimulate and help the best teacher; on the other hand there is bitterness, severity and even injustice, which, though mitigated by an admirable earnestness, an imperfect knowledge of the nature and the province of philological science cannot altogether excuse.

Almost simultaneously with Mr. Collins's book, there has appeared 'English Words: An elementary study of derivations' by Charles F. Johnson (Harper and Brothers).

"Its object is to call attention to the literary values of words as far as can be in a brief examination of derivations. It is hoped, therefore, that it may not be without interest for that large class who, though in no sense specialists, take an interest in the history of words, and that some young men may be prompted by it to take up the study of our language seriously."

But let that young man who may be thus attracted towards a serious study of his vernacular think of Mr. Collins's words:

"of all the sciences Philology is the most repugnant to men of artistic and literary tastes."

If breadth of mind, quickness of sympathy and cultivation of taste is life, then "the narrow and narrowing discipline of mere philological culture" is death,—that is the note of warning Mr. Collins would sound. But even in its lower forms Philology will continue to have an interest for some people, for such as can see recorded history and "frozen music" in mere words, and in the development of languages a reflection of significant mental processes. There will continue some denial of Mr. Collins's statement that "in the interests of Literature there can be no compromise with Philology," and Trench 'On Words,' and Johnson too, will continue to impart something like the acquisition of "another sense" to the average unbiassed man of culture. It is to be regretted, however, that Professor Johnson's well written book falls below Darmesteter's 'Life of Words' in philological reasoning and the revised Trench in philological accuracy.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

SHAKESPEARIANA. *July and October*; Harman, H. P., The Shakespearian Entourage.—Wates, A., Montaigne, Florio, Shakespeare.—Commerton, M., Shakespeare's delineations of Dotage.—Calkins, E. A., Ben Jonson not Bacon's Amanuensis.—Auld, R. C., Where Macbeth was slain.—de la Lozler, J., Cymbeline.—Cooke, M. W., Ophelia and Hamlet.—Hagerman, H. M., Byron's appreciation of Shakespeare. Shakespeare's Fellow-Townsmen and First Printer.

POET-LORE. *May-November*: Fleay, F. G., The Story of Shelley's Life in his "Epipsychidion."—Brinton, D. G., The new poetic form as shown in Browning.—Jastrow, M., An Arabic version of Macbeth's "moving wood."—Moulton, R. G., The Wandering-Jew Legend.—Furness, H. H., The text of Shakespeare.—Wurtzburg, C. A., The plot of "As You Like It."—Woodbury, C. J., The secret power of Pippa's power.—Ross, M., A deterioration of the Stage.—von Wildenbruch, Ernst, Harold: A Drama.—A Sketch of Ernst von Wildenbruch.—Why "The Tempest" is short?—Hudson, W. H., A Love-Drama of the tenth century.—Cook, A. S., The literary genealogy of Tennyson's Ulysses.—Goodlet, I., A new word on Shakespeare's Sonnets.—P. A. G., Browning study hints.—Kingsland, W. G., New Browning letters and Mrs. Orr's Life.—Brownlow, E. B., Curiosities in sonnet-literature.—Dole, N. H., Pushkin's "Boris Godunof."—Crane, W. W., The Allegory in "Hamlet."—Walton, C., A brief for Ophelia.—Goddard, H. P., The lesson of "Cymbeline."—Porter, C., Variants of Browning's "Pietro of Abano."

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. VOL. XVI. PARTS I, II.—Wentz, W., Die innern beziehungen zwischen Shakespeare's "Macbeth" und seinen königsdramen.—Ackermann, A., Studien über Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound."—Sattler, W., Zur englischen grammatik.—Wuerzner, A., Ein erlass des österreichischen unterrichtsministeriums betreffend die schriftlichen arbeiten aus den modernern sprachen an den realschulen.—Lauchert, F., Ueber das englische Marienlied im 13. jahrhundert.—Jentsch, F., Zur frage nach den quellen der mittenglischen romanze Richard Coeur de Lion.—Holthausen, F., Beiträge zur erklärungs- und textrik alt- und mittenglischer denkmäler.—Herzfeld, G., Bruckstücke von Ælfric's Lives of Saints.—Koebing, E., Zu der Whiteney-version der Regula S. Benedicti.—Varnhagen, H., Zur etymologie von *preost*.—Kaluza, M., Zu den "Boten des todes."—Sprenger, R., Zu John Lilly's "Campaspe"; Zu Marlowe's "Edward II"; Zu Philip Massinger's "The Virgin-Martyr"; Zur Hattosage in England.—Koebing, E., Zu Dryden's "Annus Mirabilis"; Zu Byron's "Prisoner of Chillon."—Kaluza, M., Strophische gliederung in der mittengl. rein alliterirenden dichtung.—Oliphant, E. H. C., The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher.—Holthausen, P., Dryden's heroisches drama.—Swoboda, W., Vermittler im streite um die reform im sprachunterricht.

ANGLIA, VOL. XIV. PART III.—Lulek, K., Beiträge zur englischen grammatik: Zur entstehung des ne-

iu; Frz. *eu*, *ieu* im Englischen; Der lautwert vom me. *oi*.—Holthausen, F., Zu alt- und mittenglischen dichtungen.—Sarrasin, G., Die entstehung der Hamlettragödie.—Fluegel, E., Die gedichte der königin Elisabeth.—Grade, P., Das Negerenglisch an der Westküste von Afrika.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ROMANISCHE PHILOLOGIE. XV. BAND. 3. 4. HEFT. 1891.—Schlavo, G., Fedee Superstizione nell'antica poesia francese (Forts).—Stiefel, A. L., Lope de Rueda und das ital. Lustspiel.—Voreltsch, C., Der Reinhard Fuchs Heinrichs des Glchezäre und der Roman de Renart.—Bonnier, Ch., Lettres de soldat.—Salvioni, C., Il "Sermone" di Pietro de Barsegapè riveduto sul cod. e nuovamente edito.—Hornling, A., Zur Behandlung der tonlosen Paenultima im Französischen.—Schulze, A., Zur Lehre vom französischen Infinitiv.—Vernischtes.—Suchler, A., Provenzalische Verse aus Nürnberg.—Tobler, A., Zu Dantes Convivio IV 12.—Lang, H. R., Zu Calderon.—Foerster, W., Sebre im Roland.—Lenz, R., Zur spanisch-amerikanischen Formenlehre.—Foerster, W., Etymologien.—Cornu, J., Paisible.—Crescini, V., Nomi dati nel medio evo a' francesi meridionali.—Besprechungen.—Levy, E., K. Stichel, Beiträge zur Lexikographie des provenzalischen Verbuns.—Meyer, G., Prince L.-L. Bonaparte, Linguistic Islands of the Neapolitan and Sicilian provinces of Italy, still existing in 1889.—Dias, E., A. Pimentel, Obras do poeta Chiado.—Hornling, A., P. Marchot, Le Patois de Saint-Hubert.—Lang, H. R., F. Araujo, Gramática razonada histórico-crítica de la lingua francesa.—Rudow, W., Ar. Densusiuanu, Istoria limbei si literaturii române.—Rudow, W., G. Popa, Tablele cerate descoperite in Transilvania.—Foerster, W., Le Bestiaire hrs. von Reinsch.—Schneegans, H., L. Pirandello, Laute und Lautentwicklung der Mundart von Gergenti.—Gaspary, A., Il Propugnatore N. S. Vol. III. fasc. 3-4, Gennaio—Aprile 1890.—Gaspary, A., R. Wendriner: Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana. Anno VIII, Vol. XVI, fasc. 1-2, 3; Anno IX, Vol. XVII, fasc. 1.—Levy, E., Revue des langues romanes. Tome XXXII. Octobre-décembre. 1888. Tome XXXIII. Janvier-décembre, 1889.—Stiefel, A. L., H. Tiktin: Nachträge und Berichtigungen.

ROMANIA. No. 80. OCTOBRE. 1891.—Batiouchkof, Th., Le Débat du corps et de l'âme (fin).—Meyer, P., Nouvelles catalanes inédites (fin).—Mélanges.—Coquilles lexicographiques (Ad. Hatzfeld, A. Thomas) Périodiques.—Chronique.—Les prochains numéros contiendront: Meyer, P., Phonétique provençale. A tonique (avec carte).—Paris, G., La Chanson d'Antioche provençale et la Gran Conquista de Ultramar (fin).—Le c devant e, i en latin et en roman.—Bljvancik, W. G. C., Villon inédit.—Meyer-Luebke, W., La 1re personne du pluriel en *-ons*.—Neubauer, Ad. et Meyer, P., Le Roman d'Esther, poème provençal composé par un juif au xiv. siècle.—Pilot, E., Fragments de Mystères de la Passion (suite).—Rajna, P., A cosa si deve la conservazione dei Giuramenti di Strasburgo.—Raynaud, G., La Châtelaïne de Vergi.—Thomas, A., La loi de Darmesteter en provençal.—Ward, H. L., D., Recherches sur Merlin.—Weigand, G., Études sur le roumain de l'Istrie.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1892.

NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

Modern Language Association of America.

THE National MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION held the first session of its Ninth Annual Convention in the lecture room of Columbian University, Washington, D. C., on the evening of December 28th. Dr. James C. Welling, President of the University, welcomed the members of the Association on behalf of the university and city, and was followed by Hon. A. R. Spofford, Librarian of the Congressional Library, who read a paper on "The Characteristics of Style." He described briefly the leading characteristics of the great writers of English literature from the time of Queen Elizabeth to the present. He contrasted the qualities of the German language with those of the French, spoke of the originality and beauty of style of Goethe in the one language, and of Voltaire, Rousseau and Hugo in the other, and then began a review of American literature from the time of Cotton Mather. He regarded Poe as the most musical and forcible of American poets, and Hawthorne as the greatest artist among the novelists of this country.

The second session opened with a paper by Prof. Th. W. Hunt of Princeton College, on "James Russell Lowell as a Prose Writer." The writer showed the chief qualities of Lowell's prose: his clearness, directness and sincerity; his attempt always to clothe plain sense in plain words; his grace and ease, finish and taste; his skill in elaborating an idea without becoming redundant; his thorough command over thought and its mode of expression; his minute knowledge of words and his power of using them so as to produce the greatest effect. Lowell divided his ability equally between prose and verse and did not make the one subordinate to the other. His prose is national and literary because it is in keeping with nature and art, with time and place. His prose is seen to best advantage in

his criticism, which shows a serene impartiality of mind, with nothing narrow nor provincial. He was, and aimed to be, a literary critic, not a philosophic propounder of critical principles. His chief delight was to discover what was best in men and books; he was all-absorbed in literature from pure love of the work, and was in the best sense a cultured man and writer, but to call him scholar we must limit the meaning of that word. He was free from all moral stain, and had a loftiness of mind and spirit. It is too early to assign him his relative rank in literature.

The discussion of the paper was led by Dr. Charles W. Kent of the Univ. of Tennessee, who spoke of the tendency of Lowell in his later years to use words not in current use, or in a sense only known to scholars:—Professor A. M. Elliott, of Johns Hopkins Univ., gave some personal reminiscences of Lowell.—Professor James Morgan Hart of Cornell spoke of Lowell's message to the teachers of modern languages: the study of literature is pursued too much as laborious toil, and not sufficiently as a pleasure. The study of philology is not an end, but the means to an end,—the enjoyment of literature.

Mr. A. F. Chamberlain of Clark Univ., read a paper on "Diminutives in *-ing* in Low German" in which he showed the preference of different Low German dialect writers for this diminutive, or for others. One of the notable peculiarities of the use of *-ing* is in connection with the personal pronoun of address.

Dr. H. C. G. von Jagemann of Harvard Univ., referred, in opening the discussion, to the danger of drawing conclusions from the works of modern dialect writers because of the artificiality of the language they use. Better results may be obtained by a study of the spoken speech.

A paper by Dr. Daniel Kilham Dodge of Columbia College, on "Augustini Sendebrev til Cyrillus, and Jeronymi Levnet," (Gl. Kong. saml. No. 1586, Copenhagen) was read by Mr. E. H. Babbitt, also of Columbia. A description was given of the MS. and of its history, and an outline of the work done on it by Dr. C. J. Brandt of Copenhagen, was added. The

writer referred to the orthography, the distinction between open and closed vowels in the MS., the grammatical forms and vocabulary, and the foreign influences on the language. Mr. Babbitt stated that this is the first MS. of Old Danish ever edited outside of Denmark.

Mr. Gustav Gruener of Yale Univ., followed with a paper on the "Genesis of the Characters in Lessing's 'Nathan der Weise' with special reference to the criticisms of Kuno Fischer." Mr. Gruener spoke of the plot of the drama and of the influence of the literary and historical sources, together with personal reminiscences which influenced Lessing in the creation of his characters. An account of the theological quarrel with Goëze was given, and Lessing's Confessions with regard to it. Evidence was adduced to show that Goëze was satirized in the character of Heraclius. The religious aspect of the drama was discussed, and an inquiry entered upon as to whether the author intended to attack Christianity and exalt the Mosaic religion.

Professor Hart of Cornell, in discussing the paper, said he considered the play to be an attack on dogmatic Christianity, and not on the essence of the Christian religion.

The next paper was by Dr. J. S. Shefloe of the Womans College (Baltimore), on the "Jersey French Dialect." An account was given of the history of the island to which no historical reference is to be found before the tenth century. Recent discoveries have shown, however, that it was inhabited by the Romans. One of the early references to it is by Wace who was born there. The island became a part of the Duchy of Normandy in 1013, but since the eleventh century has belonged to England. Most of the inhabitants speak three languages: English, French, and the Jersey French dialect. Slight differences are to be found in the language of each of the twelve parishes into which the island is divided. The English language predominates in the towns, but the French in the rural districts. The political proclivities of the inhabitants are strongly English, but their linguistic leanings are as strongly French.

The next session (fourth in order) opened with a paper on "A Study of Lanier's Poems"

by Professor Charles W. Kent of the Univ. of Tennessee. A brief account of the life of Lanier was given. Breadth of sympathy, responsiveness to the world's thought, devotion to duty, unselfishness, and depth of love predominate in this poet. Time and again he reverts to love as the means by which God is to be apprehended; the breadth of his love has no limit.—Lanier was a great poet in life. Was he great in utterance? He has tried to express too much, and much of his poetry is hard to understand. His mistake was his attempt to illustrate laws, a mistake which imposed upon him an unnatural restraint. He resembled the great poets in his high object. He seems to have sung his poems, so surcharged are they with music. The relation between his musical and literary genius was shown, and the singular harmony pointed out between the thought and its dress in the author's poems. He was a master of color-effect in word painting.

Dr. James W. Bright of Johns Hopkins Univ., speaking of Lanier, said the key-note of his work was harmony, and compared him with Blake and Rossetti. When we go to Lanier for music we find poetry, and when we go to him for poetry we find music, so that in neither case are we fully satisfied.

Professor J. L. Armstrong of Trinity College (N. Carolina), followed with a treatment of the "Gerund in Nineteenth Century English." He distinguished the gerund from the present participle, and gave the history of the former from the time of the Anglo-Saxon. In the present century the gerund occurs as subject, object and after a preposition. He spoke further of the insufficient treatment which this form has received in all English grammars.

Professor James M. Garnett of the University of Virginia, and Dr. James W. Bright of Johns Hopkins Univ., remarked upon the history of the form and characterized its varying usage at different epochs of the language.

A paper on "The Law Language in England from Edward I (A. D. 1274) to Henry VIII (A. D. 1509)" was next presented by Dr. B. F. O'Connor of Columbia College. This law language is known chiefly through notes kept by the officers of the courts. These notes constitute histories of cases, giving the argu-

ments of the counsel on both sides, the judgment of the court and the reasons for it. The reports thus jotted down, were published annually as works of reference and were known as *Year-books*. They are mostly in French, but the construction shows a considerable familiarity with Latin; later, the construction becomes English, although the vocabulary remains French.

Professor A. M. Elliott of the Johns Hopkins Univ., spoke of the great need there is for a dictionary of this language. Considerable work has already been done on the Norman-French which throws light on the Anglo-Norman, but as a field of special investigation the latter has been greatly neglected.

The fifth session was devoted to the work of the Phonetic Section, of which Professor A. Melville Bell is President. The Secretary of the Section, Mr. Charles H. Grandgent of Boston, presented a succinct report for the year, stating the kind of requests for phonetic material that had been sent out, the general character of the answers to his questions, and the results thus obtained for the pronunciation of certain American vowels. Professor Bell then read a paper on "The Sounds of *r*," showing the different sounds of *r* which proceed from the various positions of the vocal organs:—pharynx, larynx, tongue and lips, and in consequence of which the letter represents thirteen varieties of sound; in addition, it has also a glide character. In early English it was always trilled, as it still continues to be in Scotch; but in modern English there is little left of it more than the vowel quality.

Professor Thomas Logie's paper on "The Phonology of the Patois of Cachy (*Somme*)" followed. The various influences were referred to which have tended to modify the language of this region, and the chief peculiarities noted that distinguish it from the modern French and from the dialects surrounding it.

A paper was presented at the opening of the sixth session by President H. E. Shepherd of the College of Charleston, on "Philology and Literature in American Colleges and Universities." The writer made a plea for a broader literary training in the university system, and stated that the time and energy of university instructors are at present almost entirely devoted to

philology; that there is, in fact, only one university in America where the study of English Literature is pursued as an art. The reform of the present system was strongly advocated.

In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper, a large number of speakers took part, who were unanimous in submitting that the assertions made in the paper are entirely at variance with the facts. As the representative of Yale, Professor Albert S. Cook remarked, that a larger amount of time is devoted there to the courses in English Literature than to those in English Philology. The same is shown by an examination of the curriculum of Princeton. In Johns Hopkins University, courses in literature are always offered by the regular staff, besides extra courses given by non-resident instructors.

The principles of the paper were shown to be wrong in that the writer assumes that Philology can be divorced from literature, whereas the tendency of science, at the present day, is to emphasize the harmony between the two disciplines.

Miss Louise Both-Hendriksen in the paper that followed, called the attention of members of the Association to "Ignored Resources of French Literature for College Study."

In discussing the paper, Dr. F. M. Warren of Adelbert College, thought more time should be devoted to a study of the literature of the present century by introductory classes in French, and less to the study of the literature of the seventeenth century. The study of lyric poetry should not be begun too early.

In his paper on "The preparation of Modern Language Teachers for American Institutions," Mr. E. H. Babbitt of Columbia College indicated the requisites for successful work as a teacher in secondary schools, colleges and universities. The teacher should have a broad basis of general culture; must have a thorough command of English, and have a practical knowledge of the language he teaches. To obtain the best results, the teacher's general education should be obtained in American institutions; to acquire a command of the language he intends to teach he should learn it in the country where it is spoken. His special advanced work can be as well studied now in this country as in Europe.

At the seventh session, an account was

given by Professor Alc  e Fortier of Tulane University, of visits made to the Isle  os of Louisiana. This colony came here in 1778 from the Canary islands. Their customs and mode of life were described, and specimens given of their language. They generally drop the final consonants, and, in certain cases, the medial ones. Before a vowel *c* is pronounced as in French, and *s* is dropped before a consonant. These people are true children of nature who live without culture and without religion.

Professor Elliott spoke of the linguistic problems which the speech of this colony suggests. Coming as these colonists do from the Canary islands, and, at an earlier date, from Spain, we have the question of speech mixture already facing the investigator during their stay on the islands: mixture with the French from the *Pays de Caux* (Upper Normandy); B  thencourt was *Cauchois*. But before either French or Spaniards came to the Canary islands the Carthaginians were settled there, and hence we may expect to find possible traces of Punic speech among the Isle  os of Louisiana. The material so far presented is not sufficient to enable us to determine the Spanish dialect to which the language of the Isle  os is related.

The last paper offered before the Convention, was by Mr. Julius Blume of Johns Hopkins Univ., on "Jean de Mairet. A critical study in the history of French Literature." The writer discussed the chronology of de Mairet's plays as given by Parfaict, which the investigations of the last ten years have overthrown. Mr. Blume's researches show that some of the dates given by Dannheisser are likewise incorrect. "Sylvie" was written in the year 1624-5; "Sylvanire" in 1629 and "Sophonisba" in 1633. Dr. Otto has charged de Mairet with plagiarism, but the charge is not sufficiently substantiated. Leaving "Sylvanire" aside, de Mairet's other works show that he was an independent writer. Before his time, six tragedies on Sophonisba had appeared in France, but that of de Mairet is characterised by an originality that surpasses all the others.

Dr. F. M. Warren of Adelbert College, showed how de Mairet's dates may be ascertained by a comparison with those of certain works of Corneille.

At the closing session a resolution was passed expressing profound regret for the loss which the association has sustained in the death of Dr. Thomas McCabe of Bryn Mawr College.

A resolution was passed expressing the thanks of the Association to the President and Trustees of the Columbian University for generously granting the use of their building for the meetings.

The association then adjourned to meet in Washington during the Christmas Holidays of 1892.

T. LOGIE.

Williams College.

"A NEW EXEGESIS OF PURGATORIO xix, 51." *

THE passage of "Purgatorio" to which the new exegesis refers describes an angel meeting Dante and Virgil and saying:

Mosse le penna poi e ventilonne,
Qui lugent affermando esser beati,
Che avran di consolar l'anime *donne*.

He moved his pinions afterwards and fanned us,
Affirming those *qui lugent* to be blessed,
For they shall have their souls with comfort filled.

(Longfellow's translation.)

In commenting upon this passage the author of 'A New Exegesis' says:

"The difficulty consists in explaining the use and meaning of the last word *donne*."—"I believe that the true exegesis of this verse consists in explaining the word *donne* as the abridged past participle of *donare*, according to which the rendering would be: 'For they shall have their souls *gifted*, *endowed* with consolation.'"

Now this would not at all be the rendering if the writer's exegesis were rigorously applied; that is, if the word *donne* were treated and translated as the past participle of *donare*. In his translation the author apparently mistook *donare*, 'to give,' for *dotare*, 'to gift,' 'to endow,' and, accordingly, his rendering was:

"For they shall have their souls *endowed*, *gifted* with consolation," whereas it ought to have been:

"For they shall have their souls *given* with consolation."

Had the writer not fallen into the error just pointed out, the inconsistent result: "For they

* Proposed by Professor H. A. Todd in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. vi, No. 7, pp. 195-196.

shall have their souls *given* with consolation" which he would have reached, might have instantly made him aware of the inconsistency of his exegesis; but he allowed himself to be misled by the similarity in sense between *donare* and *dotare* and, paying no attention to the difference in their construction, went on building his theory upon a false premise.

The difficulties which inevitably awaited him in the course of his inquiry might still have compelled him to pause and consider and, perhaps, to retrace his steps. But the fact that either participle, *gifted* or *endowed*, did enable him to get out of the verse the sense he wanted, while *given* or any other participle in every respect like it, did not, confirmed him in his error, which seems to have become for him a kind of fixed idea.

No wonder, then, that when he looked about for authority in support of his assumption, namely, *donne* must be the abridged participle of *donare*, he failed to find any.

"I am not able," he writes, "to cite a single other occurrence of the abridged past participle of *donato*."

In spite of this, he did not, apparently, suspect that *donare* might be one of the numerous Italian verbs of the first conjugation that do not admit of an abridged past participle. And yet he did not fail to perceive that "The coincidence of form with the noun *donno* in the masculine singular would operate to prevent its use"; that is, the use of the same word as an abridged past participle.

Again: when confronted by the preposition *di* accompanying *donne* (supposed abridgment of *donate*), finding himself

"... not in a position at the present writing to cite examples of the employment of *donato* with the preposition *di*,"

the writer resorted to an example of *dotato di* ('endowed with') which

"... occurs twice," he writes, "in the *Paradiso*, and is so natural to the spirit of the Italian language as to occasion no question." But, obviously, two or even countless examples of *dotato di* can no more justify the use of *donato di* in Italian than countless examples of 'endowed with' can justify the use of 'given with' in the sense of 'gifted with' in English. Between *dotare* and *donare* exists precisely the same difference as between 'to endow' and

'to give.' Hence the expression *dotare alcuno di qualche cosa*, or 'to endow somebody with something,' is as natural and necessary, as *donare alcuno di qualche cosa*, or 'to give somebody with something' in the sense of 'to endow somebody with something,' is unnatural and impossible. This is the reason why no example of *donato di* can at any time be cited, while examples of *dotato di* occur not only twice in the "*Paradiso*," but in every instance in which the verb *dotare* with its complements is correctly used.

The other difficulty, namely, *donne* where *done* should have been expected, was not overlooked by the author; on the contrary he saw it, and thought it could be surely overcome by a mere comparison:

"The difficulty," he writes, "... is easily removed by a comparison of *Purg.* xxv, 135, where, to meet the exigencies of the rime, Dante uses *imponne* for *imponne*."

That Dante ever changed the essential form of a word to meet the exigencies of a rhyme would be, I think, very hard to prove; however, he certainly did nothing of the kind in the instance cited by the writer. Here is the passage:

... e mariti che fur casti,
Come virtute e matrimonio *imponne*.

thus rendered by Longfellow:

... and the husbands, who were chaste,
As virtue and the marriage vow *imposes*.

Evidently *imponne* is here a legitimate compound of the verb *impon* + the personal pronoun *ne* (to us), which latter, not being necessary to the sense, was omitted by Longfellow on account of the measure. The comparison, then, suggested by the writer through an evident misapprehension of the true nature of the word *imponne*, can in no way explain the presence of what he supposes to be an alien *n* in the word *donne*. Happily, however, the difficulty does not exist except for him and those who accept his theory, for *donne* is not and cannot be the abridged past participle of *donare*. *Donne* is the familiar substantive derived from the Latin *dominae*, *domnae* ('ladies') which, by virtue of its very origin, has always been pronounced, written and printed with two *n*'s.

Before concluding his article the writer remarks:

"To my mind a very convincing evidence of the correctness of the view above given is found in a passage of the 'Vita Nuova,' in which the resemblance to Purg. xix, 51 is so strong that it is difficult to believe the verse of the 'Vita Nuova' was not, consciously or unconsciously, in the poet's mind when he penned the line of the Purgatorio."

I quote here the verse and italicise it as did the writer, adding, however, for the convenience of the reader, the verse of the "Purgatorio," which the writer omitted.

E d'ogni consolar l'anima spoglia

—'Vita Nuova.'

Che avran di consolar l'anime donne.

—"Purgatorio."

"It will be seen," remarks the writer, "that the verse here italicised corresponds in every word but one with that under consideration, and, what is peculiarly noteworthy, that the word *spoglia* is an abridged participle forming an exact counterpart, with precisely opposite meaning, to the rendering here proposed."

Whether the two verses correspond with each other in every word but one, or not, the reader can see for himself.

As to the Italian word *spoglia* I have to remark that, if it was to furnish evidence in favor of the writer's theory, it should have been compared not with the English "rendering here proposed" (which is an English word wrongly introduced by the author) but with its true counterpart, the Italian word *donne*, supposed abridged participle of *donare*. As it is, then, the quoted verse of the 'Vita Nuova' affords no evidence whatsoever of the correctness of the new exegesis.

It will not be amiss in this connection to note that the above verse of the 'Vita Nuova' is cited by Andreoli, Camerini and Fraticelli in their comments on the passage of the "Purgatorio" in question, but for a different purpose from that for which it was quoted by the writer. Said commentators do not try to prove by it that *spoglia* is an exact counterpart to *donne*, or that *donne* is the abridged past participle of *donare* as *spoglia* is of *spogliare*. They cite the verse only to show by comparison that the infinitive *consolar* is used in the passage of the "Purgatorio" as a substantive in the place of *consolazione*, as it is manifestly used in the verse of the 'Vita Nuova.' Neither is any proof furnished in any of the three comments of any extraordinary meaning attributed by

Dante in the present instance to the word *donne*. There it is simply stated that the word was employed by the poet in its usual meaning of *signore, posseditrici, ricche*. These facts I have stated, because to my mind they are full of significance. However, be it noticed that, taking the word *donne* in any one of the meanings proposed by the three commentators; namely, in the meaning of either 'mistresses,' 'possessors' or 'rich' (I give preference to the last, to avoid uncouthness of expression), the rendering of the verse would be: "For they shall have their souls rich in consolation." It will be seen that this rendering is like in meaning to "for they shall have their souls gifted, endowed with consolation" proposed by the writer, and, what is essential, without the word *donne* being forced into being what it is not.

Now, if it be considered that the word *donne* is solely and invariably described as a substantive by the dictionary of the Italian language, and has heretofore been considered as such by all interpreters except the writer; that taken as a substantive in its natural and usual sense of 'ladies,' 'mistresses,' 'rich,' the word renders the verse perfectly intelligible, and the meaning of it consistent with the whole passage as well as with reason; that no commentator has ever for hundreds of years even suspected the word *donne* to be the abridged past participle of *donare*, as the writer himself half-wondering remarks; and, lastly, that by treating it as such a participle, in accordance with the exegesis under consideration, the rendering of the verse would be unintelligible, as has been shown, it will not seem too rash to conclude that the new exegesis is both groundless and needless.

There remains still a statement by the writer which calls for examination, and with this my task will be completed.

The statement is as follows:

"Purgatorio xix, 51 is one of the most variously interpreted of the intrinsically less important passages of the 'Divina Commedia'; nor can any of the numerous explanations heretofore offered be regarded as satisfactory."

That this statement truly represents the opinion of the writer on the subject, I will not doubt for a moment; but that it represents the actual reality must be denied on the strength

of the evidence furnished by the writer himself. This evidence consists in a passage from Scartazzini's Commentary to his edition of the 'Divina Commedia,' which the writer quotes, not without first remarking that in it

"Scartazzini . . . has classified the various attempted interpretations of the verse in question."

The passage is too long to be quoted here, but any one who reads it in the writer's article I am examining¹ will learn, that out of 28 + etc., etc. commentators, only seven propose various interpretations, the others; namely, 21 + etc., etc. (summed up by Scartazzini in the expression "most commentators"), all agree in interpreting *donne* in its proper meaning of *signore, padrone* (mistresses, 'possessors'), and explain: "Their souls will be possessors of consolation."

The inference which any student of Dante would seem warranted to draw from these facts would be exactly opposite to that drawn by the writer. For a passage which ("Purgatorio," xix, 51) is variously interpreted by only seven out of twenty-eight and more commentators, ought to be considered as one not of the *most*, but of the *least*

"variously interpreted of the intrinsically less important passages of the 'Divina Commedia.'"

And the one interpretation on which most commentators are agreed, and which makes the verse very plain and its sense what it must evidently be, ought surely to be regarded as satisfactory.

C. L. SPERANZA.

Columbia College.

[It is gratifying to find my modest effort so earnestly discussed by Professor Speranza. Evidently I must plead guilty to the charge of having departed from the "one interpretation on which most commentators are agreed," but fortunately it is no longer in vogue to give weight to numbers in such a matter, even when the disparity between the opposing factions is as great as that between 21 + etc., etc. and 7 + etc., etc. (the latter only a scattering minority, at that!). Should it come, however, to a question of laying authority against authority, I must prefer to stand with Scartazzini, who in my former article was quoted as saying:

"Noi dobbiamo confessare di non sapere proporre interpretazione migliore, sebbene anche questa non ci voglia andar troppo a grado."

The essential issue is: Could Dante have used the phrase *donato di* poetically in the sense of 'gifted with'? As being the opinion of a cultivated Italian, Professor Speranza's belief that he could not, is entitled to all consideration; but I am not prepared to regard it as necessarily conclusive. If his contention had reference to Ital. *dare, dato*, the uses of which have more direct analogy with those of Eng. *give, given*, I should readily yield the point; but between Ital. *dono* and *donato* I think I see the easy possibility, at least in poetic usage, of a relation similar to that between Eng. *gift* and *gifted*. As to the comparison with *imponne*, Prof. Speranza is right in doubting that Dante would have unwarrantably distorted a word to accommodate it to a rime, and is quite probably correct in seeing in *imponne* a combination of *impon* + *ne*. But the strength or weakness of my position does not depend on the aptness of this particular comparison. The interesting question is, whether Dante has here adopted a pronunciation of *done* (presumably for *donate*) which would be in accordance with a tendency at present manifested in Northern Italy, as described by Salvioni in his 'Fonetica del dialetto moderno della città di Milano' (cited by Meyer-Lübke, 'Italienische Grammatik,' § 268):

"L'n di questi casi è vibrato come la doppia toscana, ma più breve e compatta; ch'è in vece di ripartire le sue articolazioni tra la vocale antecedente e la seguente, le appoggia per intera alla seguente, quasi fosse scritto *do-nna*."

From Prof. Scott's contribution to the December number of MOD. LANG. NOTES (col. 505), I infer that he accepts the theory I have advanced and I regard Mr. A. J. Butler's gloss ("*done* = *donate*") of Buti's reading, there cited, (which, I need not say, was before unknown to me), as a corroboration of an interpretation to which I still continue to hold tentatively, while inviting the further discussion of scholars.

H. A. T.]

DIE KIRCHLICHE SATIRE UND RELIGIÖSE WELTANSCHAUUNG

in Brant's 'Narrenschiff' und Erasmus' 'Narrenlob,' resp. in den 'Colloquia.'

I.

SEBASTIAN BRANT'S berühmtestes Werk, 'Das Narrenschiff' ist nicht wie Pallas Athene aus des Dichters Kopfe entsprungen. Die grosse Familie der Narren ist so alt wie das Menschengeschlecht, und auch ihre Bekämpfung

¹ Erasmus hat die im 'Narrenlob' enthaltene Satire durchweg in den 'Colloquia' wiederaufgenommen und ernstlicher behandelt.

ung nimmt einen sehr breiten Raum in der Geschichte der Weltliteratur ein. Auch in der Satire gegen die sittlichen, politischen und kirchlichen Verirrungen, Sünden und Gebrechen am Ausgange des Mittelalters war unserem Brant eine lange Reihe Schriftsteller, wie Felix Hämmerlin² u. a.,³ vorausgegangen; "der Name war durch die häufige Wiederkehr in den Spruchbüchern des alten Testaments ohnehin nahegelegt" (Goedeke, Einl., p. xxii). Indes steht eine eingehende Behandlung der Frage nach den Vorläufern und Quellen Brant's noch ganz und gar aus; und auch der Nachweis der Einwirkungen des Narrenschiffes auf die nachfolgende Literatur Deutschlands ist eingeständenermaßen weder von Goedeke noch seinen Vorläufern (darunter selbst Zarncke) so recht vollständig geführt worden.⁴

In wiefern Erasmus dem 'Narrenschiff' Brant's verpflichtet gewesen und worin er sich von ihm unterschied, diese Frage ist trotz Max Radlkofer's wertvoller Arbeit⁵ noch nicht gehörig erörtert. Scherer erklärt kurz und bündig (Literaturgesch., p. 272): "Das ironische 'Lob der Narrheit' von Erasmus schloss sich an Brant's 'Narrenschiff' an."—Ia sogar mehr ist wahr: das 'Narrenschiff' ist für das 'Narrenlob' oft genug Quelle gewesen, obwohl sie Erasmus weder hier noch in den 'Colloquia' nennt. Wie hoch letzterer übrigens Brant geschätzt hat, geht aus seinen Worten hervor, wonach er den 'unvergleichlichen Brant' den

² Seine Werke, edirt von Seb. Brant, i. J. 1496.—H. H. Vögeli: Zum Verständniss von Meister Hemmerlis Schriften. Zürich, 1873.

³ Lessing, Band xvi. (Goedeke's Ausgabe), Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur von den Minnesängern bis auf Luthern, p. 104: anno 1470: 'Hier will ich der geistlichen Brüderschaft St. Ursula gedenken, weil sie St. Ursulae Schifflein hiess und diese Benennung gutes Licht auf Brant's 'Narrenschiff' wirft, u. s. w.'

⁴ Wackernagel, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, Basel, 1872, p. 410: Hans Sachs' 'Narrenschnitten' in der Form bedingt durch Brant's 'Nar Schiff' und näher noch durch die 'Narrenbeschwörung' und den 'Lutherischen Narr' von Murner. Verwandte Gedanken noch anderswo bei Hans Sachs im 'Narrenfresser' und im 'Narrenbad' von 1530, in dem 'Kram der Narrenkappen' von 1566, im 'Narrenbrüder', von 1668.—S. Brant's Narrenschiff von Zarncke pp. cxxx fgg. —Vgl. auch Wackernagel, p. 413.—Vilmar, L. G., p. 263.—Goedeke, Grundr., § 133.

⁵ Brant's 'Narrenschiff', Murner's 'Narrenbeschwörung', Erasmi 'Stultitiae Laus.' Literarisch-historische Parallele von Max Radlkofer. Burghausen 1877-8.

'Ruhm seiner berühmten Vaterstadt' (Strassburg) genannt hat.

Beide Werke sind Äusserungen eminent satirischer Art und trotz der wesentlich verschiedenen Auffassungen besonders auf dem religiösen und kirchlichen Gebiet, von dem wir hier fast ausschliesslich handeln wollen, sehr nahe verwandt. Erasmus benutzte die Brantschen Narrentypen, aber modernisirte sie in seinem Sinne. Denn während Brant, wie Goedeke richtig sagt, mehr dem absterbenden und untergehenden Zeitalter angehört und das Mittelalter mit seinen kirchlichen und politischen Ideen gewissermaßen abschliesst, bahnt Erasmus mit seinem gewaltigen humanistischen Rütteln die neue, menschlich freie Zeit an. Während Brant in seiner nicht so sehr häufigen, oft ziemlich versteckten Satire (Cap. xiii, wo er den Mönch-Narren, den Venus im Schlepptau hält, nur schüchtern im Bilde zeigt und eines der mönchischen Capitalaster seiner Zeit eben nur andeutet) gegen die Mönche und ihre sittlichen Schäden ziemlich zahm zu Werke geht, nimmt die Satire im 'Encomium Moriae' und in den 'Colloquia' die bitterste, schneidendste Form an: in allen Lebenslagen und von allen Seiten kommt Erasmus auf diese Schäden und Sünden zurück; der Kampf gegen dieselben ist sein 'ceterum censeo.' Und wenn auch Erasmus in letzter Instanz vor den letzten Konsequenzen seiner Polemik zurückschreckte, so ist doch das Wort eines Gegners wahr: dass der ganze Luther in Erasmus' Schriften enthalten sei. ('Coronis Apologetica': 'Clamat totum Lutherum esse in libris meis, omnia undique scatere haereticis erroribus). In Wirklichkeit ist Erasmus Protestant und Reformator, wenn er auch bei weitem weniger Lutheraner ist, als Luther Erasmaner in etwas vergrößerter Form.

Freilich war auch Sebastian Brant gegen die Zügellosigkeit des päpstlichen Hofes und die Schlaftheit der Päbste, die Verderbtheit der Mönchsorden und der Geistlichkeit nicht blind. Er sucht Papst und Kaiser zu strenger Gerechtigkeit zu veranlassen, nötigenfalls mit blankem Schwert:

"die schwert, die sint verrostet beid
und wellen nim recht usz der scheid
noch schniden me, do es ist not.
gerechtheit ist blind und dot." Cap. xlvii.

Erasmus dagegen kämpft gegen die kriegerischen Bethätigungen der Päbste, z. B. im 'Colloquium Senile,' mit scharfer Ironie, wo er spöttisch den Krieg, den Julius II gegen Frankreich angeregt, als "sanctius quiddam, ut tum quidem praedicabant, quam in Turcas" nennt. Am Schluss seiner Einleitung zu einigen von ihm übersetzten Lucian-Dialogen vom 18. November 1506 sagt er:

"In praesentia quidem in Italia mire frigent studia, fervent bella. Summus Pontifex Julius belligeratur, vincit, triumphat, planeque Julium agit. . ."

Ganz ebenso wie Erasmus hat Rabelais in dieser Frage gedacht:

" ce portrait faut (das ist: est fautif) en nos derniers papes (sc. Alexandre VI et surtout le belliqueux Jules II). Je les ay veu non aumusse, ains armiet en teste porter, timbré d'une tiare persicque; et, tout l'empire christian estant en paix et silence, *eulx seuls guerre faire felonnie et tres cruelle.*" (Rab. iv, cap. 50).

In anderen Stücken ihrer Satire, worin Erasmus dem Brant gefolgt zu sein scheint, aber seinem Werk einen schärferen antirömischen Hauch beigemischt hat, stehen sich jedoch beide sehr nahe. Gegen die Habsucht der Mönche satirisch-züchtigend vorzugehen, scheut sich Brant gewiss nicht; gegen die Jäger nach Pfründen ist er unerbittlich:

"mancher vil pfründen bsitzen düß,
der nit wer zû eim pfründlin güt"

Cap. xxx.

und die letzte Pfründe steht ihnen in der Hölle offen:

"merk : wer vil pfründen haben well,
der letsten wart er in der hell,
do wurt er finden ein presenz,
die me düß, dan hie sechs absenz."

Cap. xxx.

Ist Brant hierin scharf und streicht er die entarteten Geistlichen mit Ruten, so streicht sie Erasmus mit Skorpionen.

"Nusquam magis latent boni viri (sc. quam Romae); adeo ut saepe clarissima luce neminem videas in frequenti foro. . ."

so dann zur Ämterschleicherei übergehend, führt er das Zwiegespräch wie folgt:

"Redis igitur nobis onustus sacerdotiis"?—"Venatus equidem sum sedulo: at parum favit Delia. Nam complures illic piscantur hamo, quod dici solet, aureo." ('Coll. de Captandis Sacerdotiis,')

und im 'Coll. Senile' beinah mit denselben Worten:

"Iamque cogitare coepi de venanda Abbatia: sed primum, non omnibus hic favet Delia, et saepe longa est venatio,"

und an einer anderen Stelle desselben Coll.:

"Iam mihi vacillare coepit animus, utrum ad negotiationem intermissam redirem, an religionem fugientem persequer. Interim venit in mentem, utrumque alteri posse coniungi.—Quid? ut simul esses et negotiator et monachus?—Quidni? nihil religiosius(?) ordinibus Mendicantium; et tamen nihil similis negotiationi. Volitant per omnes terras ac maria, multa vident, multa audiunt: penetrant omnes domos plebeiorum, nobilium, atque regum.—At non cauponantur.—Saepe nobis felicius."

"Aber," fährt er fort, "ich hätte lange im Chor schwitzen müssen, bevor mir diese melkende Kuh (negotiatio) anvertraut worden wäre."

Im 'Convivium Religiosum' sagt Timotheus:

"Ich meine die Geistlichen und Mönche, welche um des Gewinnes willen im dichtesten Gedränge der Städte weilen wollen, indem dort der Gewinn zu finden sei, wo das Volk sei." (" . . . ipsos sacerdotes ac monachos, qui fere quaestus gratia malunt in urbibus, iisque frequentissimis, versari, dogma secuti, non Pythagoricum aut Platonicum, sed caeci cuiusdam mendici, cui dulce erat, premi turbis hominum, quod diceret, illic esse quaestum, ubi esset populus.")

Die Sündhaftigkeit der Geistlichen erwähnt Brant auch cap. xlv: Einst habe Christus die Wechsler und "die do hatten tuben feil" im Zorn aus dem heiligen Tempel getrieben, aber

"solt er ietz offen siind usstriben,
wenig in kilchen wurden bliben;
er fing gar dick am pfarrer an
und würt bisz an den meszner gan."

Diese Unwürdigkeit vieler Theologen seiner Zeit hat Erasmus zu Hunderten von Malen in allen Formen und Farben persifflirt: im 'Encomium Moriae' wie in den 'Colloquia' hat er dieser Art Satire den breitesten Raum eingeräumt, aber entgegen Brant mit einer Schneidigkeit, die nicht zum wenigsten den Religionssturm erregt hat, den Erasmus so gern nicht mit Unrecht indirect den Kuttenträgern seiner Zeit selbst in die Schuhe schiebt:

"Totum hoc incendium, per monachos ortum, per eosdem huc usque incanduit, quod non aliter nunc quoque conantur extinguere, quam si oleum, quod aiunt, addant camino" (mit Anspielung auf die Ketzerbrände).

Das schlechte Beispiel der höheren Geistlichen berührt Brant im cap. xl:

"kein Zucht, noch er ist me uf erd;
kind, frouen leren wort und gberd:
die frouen das von mannen hand,
die kind von elten nemen schand;
und wenn der apt die würfel leit,
so sint die münch zûm spiel bereit."

Die Spielsucht und das unkirchliche Leben,
sowie die schlechte Gesellschaft der Pfaffen
brandmarkt cap. lxxvii, "von Spilern":

"aber es ist ietz darzû kumen
das pfaffen, adel, burger, frumen
setzen an köppelsknaben sich,
die in nit sint an eren glich;
vorusz die pfaffen mit den leigen
soltent ir spil lon underwegen,
wan sie echt wol betrachten das
ir ufsatz und den alten hasz,
der Nithart ist sunst under in,
der regt sich mit verlust und gwin,
und ouch das in verboten ist
kein spil zû tûn zû aller frist."

Wie schlimm übrigens die Spielwut unter den
Geistlichen jener Zeit gewesen sein muss, geht
aus den wiederholten Anspielungen des Eras-
mus auf die der "alea" ergebenden Mönche
hervor, die sich dem Teufel in die Hände spie-
len:

"spiel mag gar selten sin on slünd,
ein spieler ist nit gottes fründ
die spieler sind des tûfels kind,"

Diese Zeilen schliessen das Kapitel von den
Spielern ab.

Auch die Unsittlichkeiten beim Tanz und
die berühmten Liebessünden der vor der
Reformation so tief gesunkenen Geistlichkeit
hat Brant zu cap. lxi erwähnen nicht unterlassen: in
dem Bilde zu cap. lxi sieht man das goldne
Kalb auf einer Säule, umtanzt von Pfaffen,
Mönchen und Laien. Bei Kirchweihen und
Primizen (prima missa)

"do danzen pfaffen, mlinch und leien,
die kutt müss sich do hinden reien;
do louft man und würft umher ein,
das man hoch sieht die bloszen bein;
ich will der ander schand geschwigen."

Freilich erwähnt er die geistlichen Herren
in letzterem Falle nur so nebenher unter den
Studenten und Laien (cf. cap. lxii), während
Erasmus sowie Rabelais das ganze Gift ihrer
Satire aus diesem Lasterleben der Kuttenträger
ihrer Zeit ziehen.

Gegen die Bildungsroheit des geistlichen
Standes, den er den anderen "groben narren"
einzureihen nicht unterlassen kann, wendet
sich Brant in cap. lxxii:

"wer ietz kan triben sollich werk,
als treib der pfaff vom Kalenberg⁶
oder mlinch Eilsam mit sim bart,
der meint, er tûg eine gûte fart . . ."

und fügt eine Satire auf den groben Ton bei,
der damals herrschte (cf. Birch-Hirschfeld,
'Gesch. der französ. Lit. im xvi. Jahrhundert,'
p. 229 und p. 259, Anm.: "Man darf nicht
vergessen, welche Freiheiten der Umgangston
seines Zeitalters gestattete;") wobei er den
Unfug, womit die heiligen Metten, das ist die
sieben Tagzeiten des Gebets Mette, aufgeführt
wurden, in das rechte Licht stellt:

"so hebt die su die metten an,
die primzit ist im Eselton,
die terz ist von sant Grobian;
hutmakerknecht singen die sext,
von groben filzen ist der text;
die wüst rot sitzet in der non,
schlemmer und demmer darzû gon;
darnoch die su zur vesper klinget,
unflot und schamperion dan singt;
dan würt sich machen die complet
wan man "all vol" gesungen het. . ."

Und die Sündhaftigkeit des Schlemmerle-
bens wird mit dem bösen Beispiel der Pfaffen
entschuldigt, denn:

"wer es so stünd, als sie uns schriben,
sie dâten es nit selber triben.
wan nit der pfaff vom tûfel seit,
der hirt von wolffen klagt sin leit,
so hetten sie beid nît darvon."

Die Trägheit der Geistlichen jener Zeit ist
beinah sprichwörtlich geworden:

"jeder bur will ein pfaffen han,
der sich mit müssiggan erner,
on arbeit leb und sig ein her;
nit das er das tûg von andacht
oder uf selen heil hab acht,
sunder das er mûg han ein hern,
der all sin gschwister mûg ernern."

Erasmus und besonders Rabelais werden
nicht müde, diesen Punkt besonders hervorzu-
heben.

"Der Mönch ist unnütz wie ein Affe. So
ein müssiger Mönch ackert nicht, wie der
Bauer; er hütet des Landes nicht, wie der
Kriegsmann; heilt die Kranken nicht, wie der
Arzt; er lehret und predigt nicht dem Volk,
wie ein guter evangelischer Schulmeister,
führt dem Staat keine Waaren nach Notdurft
zu, wie der Handelsmann. Da habt ihr die
Ursach, warum sie allen ein Greuel und Ge-
spött sind (Rab. i, 40).

"Tous ocieux, rien ne faisant, point ne tra-

⁶ Vgl. über Kalenberg und Mönch Isan aus dem 'Rosen-
garten' Goedeke's Anmerkungen zu cap. lxxii.

vaillant, poids et charge inutile de la terre: craignant le ventre offenser et emmaigrir, etc.,

nennt er sie an einer anderen Stelle (Rab. iv, 58). Kein Wunder, dass auch Erasmus, der das Princip: "otium ceu pestem quandam fugio" ('Pietas puerilis') gegen den Müssiggang als aller LasterAnfang immer wieder ankämpft.

Eine der ergiebigsten Quellen für die Satire jener Zeit war die bodenlose Unwissenheit und Bildungsfeindschaft der meisten Geistlichen. Die Zeiten, in denen der Geist der Reinigung in der Kirche noch lebendig und eine heilige Herrschaft ihr Ideal war, waren längst vorüber. Jetzt hielt sie das Denken durch ihre Dienerin, die Scholastik, in Zucht und Banden. Gewiss verdanken wir die Erhaltung der klassischen Literatur, soweit sie uns eben erhalten ist, vorzugsweise den Klosterbrüdern, aber selbst in den besten Zeiten war sie auf Gastfreundschaft angewiesen, niemals Selbstzweck, ein Heimatrecht hatte man der Klassik nie gegönnt (vide Georg Voigt, 'Die Wiederbelebung des klass. Alt.', Einl.). In der Zeit aber, von der wir hier handeln, war die Klassik in den Klosterschulen in völlige Barbarei ausgeartet. Der Ignoranz der Pfaffen widmet Brant besonders das cap. lxxiii:

"des findt man ietz vil junger pfaffen,
die als vil können als die affen
und nement doch selsorg uf sich,
do man kum eim vertrut ein vich;
wissen als vil von kirch regieren
als müllers esel kan quintieren;
die bischöf, die sint schuldig dran,
sie soltens nit züm orden lan
und zü selsorgen vorusz nüt,
es werent dan ganz dafferlüt,
das einer wer ein wiser hirt,
der nit sin schof mit im verflürt,
aber ietz wänen djungen laffen,
wan sie allein ouch werent pfaffen,
so hett ir ieder was er wolt."

Erasmus äussert sich wiederholentlich noch viel schärfer über diesen Gegenstand:

Nihil aliud video causae nisi quod multi theologi neglexerint et linguarum peritiam et Latini sermonis studium, una cum priscis ecclesiae doctoribus, qui sine hisce praesidiis intellegi non possunt: praeterea quod difficillimum sit revellere, si quid penitus insederit animo. Porro videas quosdam tantum *scholasticis placitis* tribuere, ut malint ad ea detorquere scriptum, quam ad scripturae regulam opiniones humanas corrigere." ('Concio sive M.')

Besonders lag aber die griechische Bildung brach:

'In Synodo Grammaticorum' bekennt der Humanist, 'ideo studium cuiusdam Carthusiani, suo iudicio doctissimi, qui quum in graecas litteras soleat stolidissime debacchari, nunc libro suo indiderit Graecum titulum, sed ridicule...'

So sah es in Deutschland aus, so in Frankreich:

'*Graecum est, non legitur*, avait cours dans les écoles, Les moines disaient dans leurs sermons: On a trouvé depuis peu une nouvelle langue qu'on appelle grecque. Il faut s'en garder avec soin: cette langue enfante toutes les hérésies.' (V. Nisard, 'Hist. de la Lit. fr.', i, p. 248).

Im 'Coll. Abbatis et Eruditae' lässt Erasmus den Abt Antronius sagen:

'Ego nolim meos monachos frequenter esse in libris';

und auf die Frage der gebildeten Magdala:

'Sed quam ob rem tandem non probas hoc in monachis tuis?'

antwortet er:

'Quoniam expior illos minus morigeros: responsant ex Decretis, Decretalibus, ex Petro et Paulo... Quid illi doceant nescio, sed tamen non amo monachum responsantem: neque velim quemquam plus sapere quam ego sapiam...'

Der Abt selbst sieht sich am Studium gehindert durch 'prolixae preces, cura rei domesticae, venatus, equi, cultus aulae.' Im weiteren Verlauf des Dialoges hält der Abt dafür, Frauen dürften kein Latein verstehen, "quia parum facit ad tuendam illarum pudicitiam."

Ma: "Ergo nugacissimis fabulis pleni libri Gallice scripti faciunt ad pudicitiam"?

Abt: "Tutiores sunt a sacerdotibus (sc. mulieres), si nesciant Latine."

Ma: "Da ist kine Gefahr...; quandoquidem hoc agitis sedulo, ne sciatis Latine."

Sodann schliesst sie mit der echt humanistischen Wendung:

"... malim (sc. meine Fähigkeiten) in bonis studiis consumere, quam in precibus sine mente dictis, in pernociibus conviviis, in exhauriendis capacibus pateris"

und fährt fort:

"Olim rara avis erat Abbas indoctus, nunc nihil vulgatus... Wenn Ihr Ignoranten Theologen Euch nicht hütet, so wird es noch dahin kommen, dass wir Frauen in den Theologenschulen den Vorsitz führen, in den Tempeln predigen... schon ändert sich die Weltbühne, ein neuer Morgen tagt, eine neue Welt geht auf!"

Den Stand der hebräischen Bildung hat der Streit Reuchlins mit den Kölner Theologen satssam enthüllt. Siehe auch 'Peregrin. Relig.':

"Isti quidquid non intelligunt, Hebraicum vocant. . . . Quoties advenisset aliquis vetustus theologiae aut iuris doctor, adductus est ad Tabellam: alius dicebat esse literas arabicas, alius ficticias: tandem repertus est qui legeret titulum. Is descriptus erat verbis ac literis Romanis, sed maiusculis. . . ."(!).

Kein Wunder, wenn auch Rabelais, der sprachgewaltige Rabelais, seine Satire in dem Satze culminiren lässt: "Magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos sapientes."

Den unvernünftigen Einfluss, der oft genug geübt wurde, um Unmündige, die den Schritt noch nicht ermessen konnten, zu zwingen, das Klosterkleid anzunehmen, hat Brant und Erasmus behandelt. Doch war der Missbrauch so allgemein und augenscheinlich, dass Erasmus ihn auch wohl unabhängig von seinem Vorläufer behandelt haben mag. Mancher. . .

"loszt sich jung zu prister wißen,
der dan sich selb dñt maledien,
das er nit lenger gbeitet (gewartet) hat";

. . . und später:

'man stoszt manch kind ietz in ein orden;
es ist zu eim menschen worden
und es verstand, ob das im si
güt oder schad, stückt es im bri.
wie wol güt gwonheit bringet vil
rut es doch manches underwil,
die dan verfluchen al ir frñt,
die ursach solches ordens sint.
gar wenig ietz in klöster gont
in solcher ält, das sies verstont,
oder die durch gots willen dar
kumen, und nit mer durch ir nar
und hant der geistlichkeit nit acht. . . '

Cap. lxxiii.

Diesen wunden Punkt behandelt Erasmus vorzugsweise in der 'Virgo Misogamos' und in der 'Pietas Puerilis.' In der Verteidigungsschrift 'De Colloquiorum Utilitate' sagt er:

"... detestor eos, qui adolescentes aut puellas invitis parentibus pelliciunt in monasterium, abutentes illorum vel simplicitate vel superstitione; persuadentes eis non esse spem salutis extra monasteria. Nisi talibus piscatoribus plenus esset mundus: nisi innumera felicissima ingenia per istos infelicissime sepeherentur ac defoderentur viva, quae fuissent electa vasa domini, si iudicio sumpsissent institutum naturae congruens."

Es liege eine grosse Gefahr für die Sittlichkeit der Novizen in dem Kloster. Sicherer seien die Jungfrauen bei den Eltern, als dort ("quam apud illos crassos, semper cibo distentos monachos"). Denn 'plures inveniuntur (sc. in monasterio), quae mores aemulentur Sapphus, quam quae referant ingenium.' Aber bald kam auch die Reue, die Erasmus in der 'Virgo Poenitens' weitläufig behandelt (cf. auch 'Mil. et Carth': "Non dubito quin iam dudum poeniteat te instituti: paucos enim comperio, quos non capiat poenitudo"). Daher will der weise Jüngling, den Erasmus in 'Piet. Puer.' als Muster anführt, sich nicht in die Klosterhaft begeben, obgleich man ihn gar sehr dazu gedrängt hat:

"... crebro sollicitatus sum a quibusdam, ab hoc seculo, velut a naufragio, ad portum monasteriorum vocantibus. Sed mihi stat sententia, non addicere me vel sacerdotio, vel instituto monachorum, unde post me non queam extricare, priusquam mihi fuero pulchre notus."

Gegen die Bettelmönche und die falschen Reliquien wendet sich Brant in cap. lxxiii:

"der bätzel hat ouch narren vil
all welt die riecht sich ietz uf gil
und will mit bätlen neren sich;
pfaffen, münchsörden sint vast rich
und klagen sich, als werents arm.
hü bätzel, das es got erbarm" ! . . .
desglichen dñt die heiltumfürer
stürnenstösser, stazionierer,
die nienant kein kirchwiß verligen,
uf der si nit öfflich uszschrigen,
wie das sie füren in dem sack
das heu, das tief vergraben lak
under der kripf zu Bettlehein,
das si von Balams eselsbein,
ein fäder von sant Michels flügel,
ouch von sant Jörgen ross ein zügel,
oder die buntschüh von sant Claren."

Ganz in demselben Sinne hat Erasmus die erstere Frage in den 'Ptochoplusiis,' die letztere in der 'Inquisitio de Fide' 7 und besonders in der 'Peregr. Relig.' 8 behandelt.

Den unfrohen Pomp bei den Begräbnissen verdammen beide gleichermaßen (Brant, cap. lxxiii und Erasmus, 'Funus').

7 Etenim, si nunc homines tantopere sibi placeant ob vestis colorem ac figuram, quumque sic quidam ostendent sanguinem . . . Christi, et lac matris Virginis, quid credis futurum, si mansisset in terris vestitus, comedens, loquens?

8 Notantur et ii, qui reliquias incertas pro certis ostendunt, qui his plus tribuunt quam oportet, qui quaestum ex his sordide faciunt.

In seinen politischen Überzeugungen hinsichtlich der kriegerischen Wirren, der traurigen Zeiten, der inneren Schäden Deutschlands deckt sich das von Brant in caps. xlv, lvi, ix, ciii Gesagte fast durchweg mit Erasmus' Anschauungen:

"die erd ist sellig, die do hat
ein herren, der in wisheit stat,
des rot ouch iszt zû rechter zit
und sûchein nit wollust und git.
we! we dem ertrich, das do hat
ein herren, der in kintheit gat!
des fûrsten essen morgens frûg
und achten nit was wisheit tûg!
ein arm kind, das doch wisheit hat,
ist besser vil in sinem stat,
dan ein kûnig, ein alter tor,
der nit fûrsicht die kunnftig jor.
we den gerechten uber we,
wann narren stigen in die hûh"! I

Das sei der Fluch für ein Land, Narren zu Fürsten zu haben; diese seien noch schlimmer, als wenn ein Kind ein Land regiert. Auch Erasmus, der die schlechten Fürsten zum Beispiel im 'Senatulus,' im 'Charon,' im 'Convivium Fabulos,' und besonders im 'Narrenlob' satirisiert, wo er jedoch nach seiner Art sein Urteil mildert ("... ne cui videar satiram texere, non encomium recitare neve quis existimet bonos principes a me taxari, dum malos laudo"); hält dem Kaiser Karl V nach der Gefangennehmung Franz I einen echten Fürstenspiegel vor Augen. Ganz ebenso ermahnt Brant die Gewaltigen der Erde, sich nicht auf irdische Macht zu verlassen, sondern auf Gott:

'harbi merken ir gwalting all:
ir sitzen zwor in glückes fall,
sind witzig und trachtend das end,
das got das rad ûch nit umbwend;
wo uch sin zorn ergrift und grim,
der kurzlich wurt entflammen ser,
wûrt îwer gwalt nit bliiben mer,
und werden ir mit im zergan. . . .
sellig, wer hoft in got allein'!

Das cap. lvi schliesst sodann mit einem frommen Wunsche und Segen auf das heil. römische Reich deutscher Nation:

'das römisch rich blibt, so lang got wil;
got hat im gsetzt sin zit und moss'
der geb, das es noch werd so gross,
das im all erd si underton,
als es von recht und gsetz solt han.'

Im cap. xcix nimmt die Satire bei Brant einen bitter-schmerzlichen Ton an. Unter

Friedrichs III kraftloser Regierung (1440-1493) ("derwil der hirt lit in dem schlof") verfällt der Glaube und das Reich unter der Vernichtung der Ketzer Schaaren und den halb Europa umfassenden Eroberungen der Türken. Auch "die vier Schwestern der römischen Kirche" Byzanz, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antiochia sind bereits geraubt, bald kommt auch das Haupt selbst an die Reihe. Und nicht nur die äusseren Feinde reissen das deutsche Land in Stücke, auch die selbstsüchtigen Fürsten reissen sich je eine Feder aus den Schwingen des Reichsadlers und vernichten somit den Wert des eigenen Reiches. Mit einer eindringlichen Ermahnung wendet sich Brant am Schlusse an die deutschen Fürsten und fordert sie auf, den edlen König Maximilian einmütig zu unterstützen, dann werden sie wohl bald die ganze feindliche Welt besiegen.

Ganz analog hat Erasmus über die inneren Schäden Deutschlands, die unpatriotische Selbstsucht der Fürsten, die Unthätigkeit derselben für das Gemeinwohl, die Raubwut der Adligen gedacht:

"Iam illud equestre dogma semper erit tuendum, ius fasque esse equiti plebeium viatorem exonerare pecunia. Quid enim indignius, quam ignobilem negotiatorem abundare nummis, quum interim eques non habeat quod impendat scortis et aleae?"

In der 'Puerpera' schildert er die politische und kirchliche Lage wie folgt, wobei er allerdings mit Carl und Ferdinand strenge zu Gericht geht: "Carolus molitur monarchiae proferre pomaeria," was er tadelt, weil die ewigen Kriege den Ruin des Reiches bedeuten (v. 'Senatulus'):

"Videmus monarchas tot iam annis nihil aliud quam belligerari: inter theologos, sacerdotes, episcopos, et populum nihil convenire; quot homines, tot sententiae; et in his ipsis plus quam muliebris est inconstantia;... 'Ferdinandus rerum suarum satagit in Germania: bulimia pecuniarum urget aulas omnes: periculosos motus concitant agricolae, nec tot stragibus ab instituto deterrentur; populus meditatur anarchiam: periculosus factionibus collabitur ecclesiae domus:... Vineam domini non ab uno iam apro vastatur;... nutat confessio, vacillant vota, labescunt leges Pontificiae, vocatur in discrimen eucharistia, expectatur Antichristus (cf. Brant's 'Prophezeiung,' Cap. ciii: "Vom endkrist"); totus orbis parturit nescio quod magni mali. In-

terim superant et imminet Turcae, nihil non populaturi, si successerit quod agunt”:

... und so geht die Schilderung des Beginnes der Reformationszeit in echt taciteischer Weise weiter.

Noch merkwürdiger scheint die richtige Würdigung der Verhältnisse durch Brant in dem letzten Decennium des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts (im Jahre 1494 erschien das ‘Narrenschiff’ zu Basel das erste Mal im Druck), als die Anzeichen des Sturmes sich immerhin noch nicht so sehr gehäuft hatten. Auch er bekennt den Verfall Roms in dem allgemeinen Verfall:

‘O Rom, du bist herabgekommen,
Hast wie das Mondlicht abgenommen,
Wenn’s schwindet und ihm Schein gebrist,
So dass jetzt wenig an dir ist.’

Cap. xcix, 107-110.

Kein Wunder, dass der Herr die sündige Welt straft. Wie den Juden einst, so sei auch den Christen wegen ihrer vielen Sünden Jerusalem verloren; und noch mehr Verlust stehe zu besorgen. Der Christenglaube, das ist der alte, reine Katholicismus, nehme ab: zu dem müsse man zurückkehren, in ihm sei die einzige Hoffnung auf Heil. Ausserhalb des Katholischen Glaubens eine Reinigung vorzunehmen, diese Idee ist Brant nie im Entferntesten beigemommen: eine antikatholische Reformation ist ihm von vornherein ein Greuel. Nur mit zarter Hand hat er die Sonde der Kritik an die Schäden der Kirche angelgt, sonst steht er voll und ganz auf dem Boden des Katholicismus, freilich eines geläuterten, reinen. Es ist wahr auch Erasmus ist ja nicht nominell, wenn auch thatsächlich, vom Katholicismus seiner Zeit abgefallen. Er hat sich vor dem Tohiwabohu des Lutherschen Reformationssturmes gescheut, gerade wie Rabelais sich von den “Démoniacles Calvins, imposteurs de Genève” (iv, 32) getrennt hat, und wie viele andere, die sich zu geistiger Freiheit emporgearbeitet, sich nicht wieder in das Joch irgend eines Reformators haben begeben wollen.

Haben wir versucht, in dem vorliegenden Artikel ein Bild von den Analogien der satirischen Polemik gegen die äusseren Schäden, die sich in der Kirche im Laufe der Zeit entwickelt hatten, bei Brant und Erasmus zu entwerfen, so soll der Schlussartikel die un-

überbrückbaren Gegensätze in der Auffassung von Kirche, Religion und Glauben bei beiden Männern kurz darzustellen versuchen.

HERMANN SCHÖNFELD.

Johns Hopkins University.

INTRODUCTION TO PHONETICS.

An Introduction to Phonetics (English, French and German) with Reading Lessons and Exercises, by LAURA SOAMES, with a Preface by DOROTHEA BEALE. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan & Co., 1891.

THE few men in this country who have tried to teach phonetics must, it seems to me, all have found that the greatest difficulty lies in making a beginning. Our pupils are so blinded by prejudices and misconceptions that, until their minds have been duly prepared, even such masterpieces as Sweet’s ‘Primer’ and ‘Elementarbuch’ are incomprehensible to them. For this work of preparation Miss Soames’s ‘Introduction’ will prove to be a valuable instrument; and it will be useful, also, in giving some correct ideas of pronunciation to persons who do not care to pursue the subject further. It addresses itself, not to an ideally enlightened reader, but to such students as we actually have to deal with. The author makes no claim to originality: for English sounds she seems to rely, in a general way, on Sweet, and for French and German she closely follows Passy and Viator; but she uses her authorities discriminatingly, and a happy sense of utility leads her almost always to subordinate unimportant details and doubtful points to essential facts. Thus, although she evidently believes in the distinction of “narrow” and “wide” vowels, she does not include it in her exceedingly simple plan of classification.

The worst fault I have to find with the book is that it is too big: the sight of it is likely to strike novices with terror. While the matter offered is all serviceable, it could probably be used to better advantage if it were contained in two separate volumes. Many of the lists and discussions are more interesting to the orthoëpist and the spelling-reformer than they

could be to the beginner, for whom this 'Introduction' is primarily intended. At any rate, the author should have furnished us with a full index. The work opens with a set of tables, followed by a few cuts. Then we have one hundred and nineteen pages devoted almost entirely to English; and, after that, twenty-two pages of French and twenty-one of German. At the end there are eighty pages of reading lessons and exercises, mainly in English.

Miss Soames uses different alphabets for English, French, and German, each one being based on the regular orthography of the language. This may be a good plan; but some of her spellings appear to me unnecessarily clumsy. An Italicized trigraph (*eun*) is surely too long a symbol for the French "low-front-round" nasal vowel, and such forms as *zahqen*, *zahchte* (*sagen*, *sagte*) are apt to make the uninitiated wonder where the advantage of phonetic notation comes in. By the use of some turned letters and a few more diacritics many complications might have been avoided. It would, at least, have done no harm to employ throughout the same sign for vowel length: in the French part we find a colon (:), in the German an *h*, while in English the quantity is indicated by the vowel-symbol itself, long and short *æ* not being distinguished. There is, furthermore, in the texts, a certain discrepancy between the character of the English pronunciation and that of the French; the former is stiff almost to pedantry, final *r* being everywhere written, and such forms as unaccented 'for,' 'him,' 'of' receiving their full values (*fôr*, *him*, *ov*); while the French is rather colloquial, the words *ils trouvèrent une*, for instance, appearing as *i trouvd:r un*.

'Stops' and 'continuants' are excellent names for the two classes of consonants; but English *r* is scarcely a "trill," and the German terms 'hard' and 'soft' are poor substitutes for 'voiceless' and 'voiced.' The cuts are good, especially those representing the larynx, which are borrowed from Techmer and Mackenzie. The drawing intended to show the respective places in the mouth where the different vowels are "formed" is similar to one given by Viëtor; it does not correspond at all to my vowel positions. The V-shaped

arrangement seems to me entirely out of place for English pronunciation. My idea of the grouping of back and front vowels is roughly illustrated by the following diagram, in which the Roman letters represent English, and the Italic characters denote French and German sounds:—

		i	i
u	u	e	e
o	o	æ	
	ɔ		

The 'Introduction' gives, in general, a clear and accurate description of the sounds of French and German and their principal combinations. I think, however, that uvular *r* is not made sufficiently prominent. For an Englishman or an American learning French or German pronunciation, the *r* is the central point, so to speak, of the whole system: he must master either the uvular consonant or the tip-trill, and I am not sure that he will find the former any harder than the latter. It is certainly misleading to say that "Parisian guttural *r* is not allowed to be used on the stage, or in singing," and that "it is not as yet heard in the best German." Very few Parisians, either off or on the stage, seem to have any conception of a point-*r*: what I have heard called, by northern Frenchmen, an *r linguale* has almost invariably been, in reality, the neat trill of a short and flexible uvula; while the flap of a long or heavy *luette* is known as an *r grasseyée*. With regard to the "best German" I can say that at least nine-tenths of all the well-educated Germans I have known (most of them from Middle Germany) use only the uvular *r*; of the lecturers whom I heard in Leipzig only one had a point-trill.

Too much importance has, on the other hand, been given to the glottal stop in German. Miss Soames states the rule, "It occurs before all initial vowels," and spells her texts accordingly. So we have, for example, the verse "Mein Bier und Wein ist frisch und klar" with glottal stops before *ist* and both *und*'s. This strikes me as being very like the attempted representation of the Cockney dialect in some of our American comic papers, where we find such sentences as "Hi ham hin-formed that hit his hin the 'ouse." Considering the great diversity of practice among

Germans, I cannot help thinking that a much safer general statement for beginners would be: "It is regularly used, by most Germans, before accented initial vowels." The same sound is occasionally heard in English.

Miss Soames recognizes a difference between French and English *w* (as in *oui* and 'we'), but she describes it only by saying, vaguely, that one appears to be "narrow" and the other "wide." In point of fact, French *w* is longer than English, and is pronounced with a much smaller lip-opening. French *â* and *a* (as in *pâte* and *pâte*) are hard to place, because they are sounded so differently by various persons. I find that in the speech of some Frenchmen, French *â* is nearly like my *o* in 'pot' (lengthened), and French *a* is similar to my *a* in 'part' (but, of course, often much shorter); while in the pronunciation of others, French *â* is like my *a* in 'part,' and French *a* is not very far from my *æ* in 'pat.' Moreover, even in the dialect of a single person, neither of the two sounds is the same in all the words in which it occurs.

The English part of the book is elaborated with the greatest care, and abounds in new material and practical suggestions. The chapter on 'Common Mistakes' will be particularly attractive to Americans. Miss Soames's own speech, as shown in this volume, forms an interesting subject for study; it has already been made, by Mr. R. J. Lloyd (*Phonetische Studien*, v, 1, p. 78), the basis of a most useful comparison of North and South English pronunciations. I wish to mention briefly a few points, and shall use for that purpose the alphabet of the American Dialect Society.

In words like 'ask,' 'pass' the vowel is *a*; this is also my pronunciation, but I use *æ* in 'trans,' where Miss Soames has *a*. Such words as 'cost,' 'loss,' are given with *ɔ*, except 'falter,' 'fault,' 'halter,' 'malt,' 'palfrey,' 'laurel,' 'salt,' 'vault,' 'want,' which have *o*; my vowel is *ɔ* in all these cases. "Long *u*" appears as *yʌ* except after *r* or consonant+*l*; I say *û* regularly after *t*, *r*, *s*, *f*, *y*, and *ʒ*, and generally after *d*, *n*, *p*, and *l*. In Miss Soames's *ai* and *au* the first element is the *a* of French *pâte*; this is approximately the case for my *ai*, but not for my *au*, the first element

of which lies between *a* and *o*. Her 'oi,' is *ɔi*; mine is, I think, rather *de*. I agree with her in pronouncing '-ture' as *ʃʃə* in such words as 'future,' but not in saying *iks-* or *igz-* for 'ex-' Her *a* may be described as "low-back." Her *ɛ* is rather a "mid-mixed" than a "low-mixed" vowel, but differs from mine by being unrounded; whereas her *o* is round and mine is not. Her *â*, *ɔ*, *i*, and *ɛ* are probably more distinctly diphthongal than mine.

In the dialect of the 'Introduction' *r* before a consonant (either in the same or in another word) is not sounded at all after *a*, *ɛ*, *ɔ*, *ɔ*, and is pronounced *ɔ* after other vowels; hence 'bard,' 'bird,' 'bettered,' 'bored' appear as *bad*, *bəd*, *betəd*, *bɔd*, and 'beard,' 'bared,' 'moored,' as *biəd*, *beəd*, *muəd*. At the end of a clause *r=ɔ* after all vowels except *a*, *ɔ*, and *ɛ*; after these it is silent: 'beer,' 'bare,' 'boor,' 'bore,' 'bar,' 'better' 'burr'= *biə*, *beə*, *bua*, *bɔə*, *ba*, *betə*, *bɛ*. Before a vowel *r* is, of course, pronounced as a consonant. My treatment of *r* is the same, except in one particular: I give it the sound of *ɔ* between *ɔ* and a consonant, unless an unaccented syllable immediately follows; that is, I say *sort* ('sort,') but *sortə* ('sort of a,') Miss Soames's *i* and *u* before *r* (as in *biə*, *bua*) seem to be closer than mine. Her *e*-sound+*r* before a vowel (as in 'chary,' 'Clary,' 'fairy,' 'garish,' 'parent')=a "narrow" *æ*+a glide+*r*, the glide being so strong that 'fairest' rhymes with 'aorist'; my combination is a low *e*+a comparatively slight glide+*r*.¹ Her *e*-sound+*r* final or before a consonant (as in 'pair,' 'paired')=a "narrow" *æ*+*ɔ*; mine is *eə*. Somewhat similarly, in words that our dictionaries spell with *dr*, she has *ɔr* (or rather *ɔr?*) before a vowel, *ɔ* before a consonant, and *ɔə* at the end of a clause; I have *dr* in the first case, *də* in the second and third: that is, for her *stɔri* ('story') I say *stɔri*; for her *stɔd* ('stored,') *stɔd*; for her *stɔə* ('store,') *stɔə*.

Here are some other words in which Miss Soames's pronunciation differs from that commonly used in New England:—

	MISS SOAMES.	NEW ENGLAND.
been	bɪn	bin
boa	bɔə	bɔə

¹ If the word is not a derivative of a word in -*er*, the glide is practically inaudible. In 'caret,' 'Cary,' 'Mary,' 'Sarah,' and 'vary' I pronounce *ɛr*.

	MISS SOAMES.	NEW ENGLAND.
cordial	kɔdyəl	kɔdʒəl
dahlia	deilyə	dalyə
daunt	dɔnt	dant
difficult	dɪfɪklt	dɪfɪkəlt
dishonor	dɪz'ɔnə	dɪs'ɔnə
fortune	fɔt'ən	fɔt'ʌn
Gladstone	glædstən	glædstən
haunt	hɔnt	hant
hideous	hidyəs	hidias
holiday	holidi	holidē
invalid	invəl'id	invəlid
issue	isyū	i/ū
landscape	lænskip	lænskēp
lieutenant	left'enənt	lāt'enənt
mancœuvre	məny'uvə	mən'uvə
Noah	nɔə	nɔə
princess	prɪns'es	prɪnsis
Raleigh	rəli	rəli
rowlock	rɛlək	rɔlək
schedule	fedyul	skedʒul
solitary	sɒlɪtəri	sɒlɪteri
statue	stætyū	stæt/ū
testimony	testiməni	testimōni
trait	trei	trēt
transition	tranz'ɪʒən	træns'ɪʒən
virtue	vɛtyū	vɛt/ū
wholly	houlli	hōli

It is interesting to know that Miss Soames says *ast* ('asked'), *sut* ('soot'), *wenzdi* (not *wednz-di*), *wūnd* (not *waund*), *yɔə* ('your'), and that she accents the first syllable of 'detail.'

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

LATIN TRAGEDY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE RENAISSANCE.

Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance von WILHELM CLOETTA. II. Die Anfänge der Renaissance-tragödie. Halle: 1892. 8vo, pp. vi, 244. Price, 6 marks.

FOLLOWING closely upon the introductory volume to the study of modern drama, reviewed in the MOD. LANG. NOTES of June last (vol. vi, cols. 364-370), comes the longer treatise of Cloetta on the beginnings of the Renaissance tragedy in Italy. Here the author considers the careers of the few writers of Latin tragedy who flourished between the middle of the

thirteenth century and that of the fifteenth, and the influence which was exerted on their works by the plays of Seneca, both genuine and assigned. The book is subdivided chronologically into two parts. The first part treats of the tragedies of the fourteenth century, the material of which was drawn from national history; the second, of tragedies at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries, which are based on ancient mythology.

To the Middle Ages properly speaking Seneca was an almost unknown dramatist, and his reputation appears to date from the last half of the thirteenth century, when are seen the first traces of the revival of learning. At that time Nicolaus Trivet (c. 1260-c. 1330), an English Dominican, wrote a commentary on Seneca's tragedies, which, however, probably had no effect on subsequent literature. But shortly before Trivet, in Italy, Lovato de' Lovati (c. 1245-1309), of Padua, studied the meter of the plays. Lovati was a friend of Mussato, and the significance of his interest in Seneca is evidently in the impulse which Mussato received from him to compose his "Ecerinis" on ancient models.

Albertino Mussato, the forerunner of Renaissance tragedy, was born near Padua in 1261. He combined, in a life of unusual activity, the qualities of an ardent patriot and successful writer; received in 1314 the poet's crown from his grateful fellow citizens, and yet, through the sudden reverses of fortune which characterized the history of the Italian communes, he died in exile in 1329. Mussato was an historian of no small merit, chronicling in prose and verse the events of his age, and left behind a considerable number of epistles, elegies and other poems, all in Latin, as were his histories. His only production in the vernacular which is known is a sonnet, perfectly unintelligible, addressed to Antonio da Tempo. But Mussato's chief claim to a place in the history of literature is based on his tragic poem, "Ecerinis."

That the "Ecerinis" is a poem and not a play, that it closes the series of epic dramas while opening the long line of modern classical tragedies, is in many ways evident. Principally in the utter lack of unity of place or even

of determined places, which could make it suited to scenic representation. Since the action in many parts of the work could not be limited to any one locality, the play could be brought before the public only in declamation. This alone would make certain its poetic rather than its dramatic nature. But, on the other hand, it clearly points to a renewal of tragedy by its imitation of the form of ancient drama, as handed down by Seneca. The "Ecerinis" is divided into five acts, it has a chorus, the narrative portion is in iambic trimeter and the lyric parts in the old choric measures. Furthermore, the chorus has little to do with the action, a point in which Seneca differed widely from the Greeks. Also the number of persons conducting the dialogue at any time is limited to three. Finally the "Thyestes" and other plays of Seneca serve as models for many passages of the "Ecerinis" while his "Hercules Oetaeus" suggests the closing chorus of "Ecerinis" and gives it both meter and number of lines.

Not only in form is the "Ecerinis" a successor of the ancient drama. It also follows the traditional opinion that the characters of tragedy should be taken only from among those great in the world's history. But in the selection of his subject, Mussato shows independence of thought as well as a patriotic and moral purpose. His material is mediæval and Christian, as distinguished from mythological and Pagan. Apart from minor borrowings from Seneca's rhetorical verses, the "Ecerinis" relates the half traditional, half historical, popular story of the life and ruin of Ezzelino da Romano and of his family. Strictly speaking, therefore, there is not in the "Ecerinis" unity of action, since Ezzelino dies in the fourth act, yet in the mind of the poet this unity may have existed, for the ruin of the family is consummated only at the end of the poem. From the choice of the subject it will be seen that unity of time was not possible, and if any other argument were necessary to prove the affirmation of Cloetta, that the "Ecerinis" is a tragic poem and not a tragedy, it could be found in the title itself, which Mussato himself states was suggested by Statius' "Thebais." Its political import, taking into consideration contemporaneous events, is no less obvious.

It was some time before Mussato had a successor in this line of composition, and the citation of a work begun, perhaps in 1387, by Giovanni Manzini della Motta, of Fivizzano, and which treated of the fall of Antonio della Scala, may bear but little on the subject. The only extant verses of this poem, to be sure, are in the form of a chorus, but they have no relation to Seneca or Mussato, and Cloetta himself admits that they may have belonged to a dialogued chronicle in verse. His conjectures regarding Manzini's possible literary connection with Salutati and Loschi are also ingenious, but not conclusive.

The introduction to the second part of the treatise develops historically the progress of Seneca study among the humanists of Italy. Both Petrarch and Boccaccio knew his plays; also their intimate friend, Pietro da Muglio (†1382), professor at Bologna and master of Coluccio Salutati. But it was the last named who performed the greatest service to the Roman author. Salutati studied into the identity of Seneca and made a copy of his plays and of the "Ecerinis." The general interest in the subject was further manifested by the appearance, toward the close of the century, of a commentary on Seneca, due to the hand of Giovanni Segarelli, of Parma.

All these investigations served as prelude to the first genuine Renaissance tragedy, in which not only the form of Seneca was followed, but also for which ancient mythology furnished the material, the "Achilles" of Antonio Loschi. This celebrated scholar and diplomat (1365-1441) was the friend of Salutati and Pogio. He has left behind many Latin letters and poems besides his tragedy, which he wrote about 1390. The "Achilles" may have been inspired by the "Ecerinis," but was neither so popular nor so long remembered, in spite of its superiority from the dramatic standpoint.

The "Achilles," in length nine hundred and thirty-nine verses; took its subject from the "Dares," and thus indirectly from the field of Greek mythology. Its form is the same as that of the plays of Seneca and in many lines it imitates their thought. Of the three unities, that of time would appear to be observed. A serious misconception of the ancient theatre is

here seen in the introduction of two leading and distinct choruses, as was done in "Octavia," then supposed to have been written by Seneca. The "Achilles" was not intended for the stage, or at least was never performed.

Some forty years after the writing of the "Achilles," in 1428 or 1429, Gregorio Corraro (1411-1464) produced his "Progne," the subject of which was taken from Ovid's "Metamorphoses," and the form from Seneca. Traces of the influence of Loschi's work are also to be found in it. The story of Philomela had already appealed to Mussato through the many tragic elements it contains. Corraro expanded the narrative of Ovid to one thousand and sixty-three lines, including choruses, and imitates quite closely in many passages Seneca's "Thyestes" and "Medea." He also paraphrases frequently the text of his original. As regards the unities, Corraro observes that of action, by beginning the play with the recital of the sins of Tereus, which naturally leads later to a stage effect. In this respect he shows a dramatic instinct superior to that of Mussato or Loschi, and goes on to prove this gift throughout the tragedy by the more artistic arrangement of his matter. He also omits the concluding chorus which his predecessors had erroneously used. But while the "Progne" is in general more technically correct, it does not observe the unities of place and time, and in style is inferior to the "Ecerinis" or the "Achilles." Yet Corraro profited by the oblivion into which these plays had fallen, and for some time after his death was regarded as the first author of modern tragedy. There is no evidence, however, that the "Progne" was ever performed.

With the "Progne," the Renaissance drama reaches the period of sudden development. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century, the classical tragedy passes from the scholar's study to the public stage. There it underwent many modifications, both from the necessity of adapting itself to acting and from the rivalry which it encountered in the popular theatre, at that time beginning to expand. The history of these changes will evidently be the theme of the next volume in this series. It would be unjust to its industrious author to pass over in silence the large number of notes which con-

tain the supporting material for the statements of the text, and which bear witness to the great amount of labor he has undergone. From these notes, and from the various appendices to the biography of the writers mentioned and other points of interest, this period of literary history can be safely assumed as having been placed on definite and sure foundations.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People.

Edited with a Translation and Introduction by THOMAS MILLER, M.A., Ph.D. Part 1, London: Early English Text Society, 1890-1.

THE Old English Bede was one of the first books selected by scholars for the printing-press. Twice before has it been printed in full: first, in 1643, by Abraham Wheelock, Professor of Arabic and first Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and again by John Smith, in 1722. Wheelock took the Cambridge University MS. as the basis of his edition, and seems to have followed it *verbatim et literatim*, only occasionally giving marginal readings from two other MSS., one at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the other in the British Museum. These three MSS. are generally known and referred to as Ca., C., and B. respectively. Wheelock gives in parallel columns, the Old English text and Bede's Latin—not his own, as we might infer from Wülker ('Grundriss,' p. 404), though he does give three forms of Bede's preface: (1) Old English, (2) Bede's Latin, (3) a literal translation of the Old English back into Latin, the last being Wheelock's own work. His edition is full of misprints, and, perhaps, of more serious defects.

John Smith's edition (Cambridge, 1722) was in all respects a great improvement on that of Wheelock. Here, again, we have both Latin and Old English texts, though in different parts of the book. Smith, also, used MS. Ca. as the basis of his text, and compared it diligently with Wheelock's text, with the two other MSS. (B. and C.) that his predecessor had used, and with two others that seem to have been unknown to Wheelock. Of the last

two MSS., one was at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and the other belonged to Thomas Tanner, who had lent it to Smith's father: they are known as MSS. O. and T. respectively. Smith used MS. T. quite largely. He placed at the foot of the page all variants from all the MSS.,

"rejectis [*scil.* lectionibus] quidem fere infinitis quæ literis tantum, vocalibus præcipue, sunt diversæ."

It may be added that the honor of this work belongs largely to George Smith (John's father), who, we are told in the epistle to the reader, in his eagerness to get the work through the press, labored more arduously than his age and strength could endure, thus bringing on a fatal illness. The undertaking then passed into the hands of John, at that time a youth of twenty-two years.

The lack of a more modern edition has been seriously felt, for both March and Sweet, in their 'Readers,' call attention to the need. Sweet's own name had been suggested in connection with the task of preparing a suitable edition, but he seemed unwilling to turn his attention to it; and eleven years ago Körner ('Einleitung,' Theil ii, s. 194) wrote:

"Eine kritische Ausgabe von Bedas hist. eccl. Angl. wird schon seit Jahren von Prof. Schipper in Wien erwartet."

Dr. Miller's book, so far as issued, is a monument of erudition, patience, and prolonged labor. We have, thus far, the Introduction (pp. xiii-lix), and Old English text with modern English translation on opposite pages (pp. 2-486):

"The second part will contain full apparatus criticus and glossary, with a conspectus of the dialectical peculiarities of all MSS."

The Introduction contains a great mass of information and statistics for which scholars will sincerely thank the editor. It begins with an exact and detailed description of the four more complete MSS. (T. B. O. Ca.) and of the fragmentary C. These descriptions are much fuller than those usually given, and are as interesting as they are valuable. Dr. Miller believes that all the existing MSS. are of a common origin. This belief is founded on four facts:

1. The division into chapters is substantially the same in all MSS.

2. All MSS. place the "*Interrogationes*" [Bk. i. ch. 27] at the end of Bk. iii.

3. All place the appeal to the reader at the conclusion of the work, and not at the end of the *Præfatio*.

4. There are common peculiarities or corruptions found in all MSS.

He might have added that the same errors occur in all, for example, p. 26, l. 18, where *anes wana prittigum* translates *viginti et octo*; and compare translation of *anno quingentesimo octogesimo secundo*, p. 54, l. 21-2. Additional instances of mis-translation are p. 6, l. 6; 6, 8; 6, 21-2; 6, 25-6: 42, 17-18. Furthermore, the additions and omissions are the same in all MSS.

Dr. Miller thinks that the Old English translation was made from the Latin text as it appears in MS. Cott. Tib. c. ii. Of twenty-eight variants all but one favor this MS., while the other favors the Moore MS. This is an interesting question, and its solution deserves a fuller collection and comparison of variants.

Dr. Miller makes the first systematic attack on the belief in Alfred's authorship of the Old-English Bede. Sweet's incidental objection to this belief has already been answered by Körner (*Englische Studien*, i, 500; also 'Einleitung,' Theil ii, 196), and by Dr. August Schmidt ("Untersuchungen über König Ælfreds Bede-übersetzung," 7-8). Compare also an article by J. Ernst Wulfing in *Englische Studien* xv, 159-60, and one by this reviewer in *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, January 1891. Dr. Miller has examined the question in the most thorough and scholarly manner, and, reasoning almost entirely from internal evidence, is led to the conclusion that the translation is of Anglian origin. He even points out conjecturally the place—the monastery of Lichfield—where the translation may have been made.

In determining an Anglian origin for the translation, Dr. Miller is influenced by several matters:

1. The history and usage of certain words; as, *on* (= *ond*); *ono* (*onu*, *ona*, *heono*); *ac* interrogative; *in*, *on*; *mid*.

2. Peculiar inflectional forms.

3. Preference for *o* rather than *a* before nasals.

4. Preference for *ā* rather than *ea* before *l*+consonant.

With a formidable array of statistics, Dr. Miller reasons that the presence in the text of

a considerable number of Anglian forms and syntactical usages incontestably indicates an Anglian archetype, and that King Alfred, therefore, could not have made the translation. The respective ages and dialectal peculiarities of the various MSS. strongly support the theory advanced. Dr. Miller places the date of T. somewhat before the end of the tenth century, C. in the latter part of the same century, to O. he gives no date, Ca. a little later than the Conquest. They exhibit dialectal peculiarities in the same order, T. having more Anglian forms than any other, then C., then O., then Ca. The three small fragments found by Zupitza in MS. Cott. Dom. A. ix are believed to be older than any of the existing MSS., and it is noticeable that they contain a number of Anglian forms not found in the others. MS. B. is little used in Miller's investigations, because its

"scribe or editor has dealt very freely with his author, changing forms and words and recasting sentences."

Dr. Miller is in possession of important facts, and it would be difficult successfully to contest the conclusion to which they lead us: yet it may be that a too intent examination of these facts has distorted our conception of the real state of the case; at all events, some other factors should enter into a full consideration of the question at issue:—

1. Alfred's desire to place suitable reading matter in the hands of his people seems to be unquestioned. Apart from all historical evidence to that effect, we may assume, for the present, that he himself acted, at times, as a translator. What, now, of all accessible books would he be most likely to translate? It is none too easy to answer this question definitely, yet it certainly seems rational to suppose that piety, on the one hand, and patriotism, on the other, should lead to the production of versions of the 'Cura Pastoralis' and the 'Historia Ecclesiastica' among the very first fruits of his labor. Would it not have been passing strange if Alfred had translated anything at all, and had neglected the history of his own country?

2. Alfred himself tells us that his translations were not for any particular class, but for "all men":

For ðy me ðyncð betre ðæt we eac suma bec ða ðe nīd-beðearfosta sien eallum monnum

to wiotonne, ðæt we ða on ðæt geðiode wend- en ðe we ealle gecnawan mægen . . . (Preface to 'Cura').

The Old English version of the 'Historia Ecclesiastica' is eminently a work that carries out these ideas, for it is far better adapted to popular reading by the omission of lengthy epistles, and of such other matter as would probably be of little interest to the average Englishman of the ninth century.

3. Dr. Miller has hardly done full justice to the historical testimony pointing to Alfred as the translator. The words of Ælfric and of William of Malmesbury are positive, and there is absolutely no historical evidence against Alfred's claim. Ælfric wrote probably less than a century after Alfred's death, and Malmesbury certainly not later than 1140: the nearness of these witnesses to Alfred's own time gives especial weight to their statements. Then there is the couplet written twice in MS. Ca.:

*Historicus quondam fecit me Beda latinum,
Ælfred rex Saxo transtulit ille pius.*

Finally, there is the West Saxon genealogy, in at least two MSS., which terminates abruptly with Alfred.

It is probably an error, however, to ascribe the whole work of this translation to any one man. We know that there were several scholars of some ability in England in Alfred's time, and nothing is more likely than that some of them should have aided the royal translator in his labors. Malmesbury, as quoted by Dr. Miller, gives us a broad hint of this:

"Præterea, quia nullus in suo regno literarum erat peritus, evocavit ex Mercia Wicciorum episcopum, qui jussu regis Dialogorum libros in Anglicum sermonem convertit."

Moreover, Alfred himself gives us an idea of his dependence upon others:

Ða ic ða gemunde hu sio lar lædengēpiodes ær ðissum afeallen wæs giord Angelcynn, ond ðeah monige cuðon englisc gewrit arædan, ða ongan ic ongemang oðrum mislicum and manigfealdum bisgum ðisses kynerices ða boc wendan on englisc ðe is genemmed on læden Pastoralis ond on englisc Hierdeboc, hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgiet of andgiete, swa swa ic hie geliornode æt Plegmunde minum ærcebisepe ond æt Assere minum biscepe ond æt Grimbolde minum mæssepreoste ond æt Johanne minum mæssepreoste (Preface to 'Cura': Körner, Theil ii, s. 36).

Dr. Miller has pointed out that each MS. is the work of several copyists, who wrote in turn. There is abundant internal evidence, too, that the translation itself is the work of more than one hand; for in many places it is quite free and idiomatic, and in other passages it is so oppressively literal as hardly to be English at all. None but the veriest tyro in Latin could have blundered so hopelessly in rendering the heading of Chap. 9 of Book i.; and with the translation of *viginti et octo*, already given, we may compare (p. 252, l. 9) *per novendecim annos=anes wonde twentig wintra* [MS. B. has *an læs þe twentig*]; (238, 2) *undesexaginta=anes wonþe syxtig*; (386, 25) *decem et novem annis=anes wonþe twentig wintra*. Possibly herein lies the reason why the name of no one man is mentioned in the text as the translator.

While Dr. Miller comes to us as a man with a theory—for which, indeed, he contends manfully—to his lasting credit be it repeated that he has examined this question of authorship in a spirit of the utmost fairness and candor, and, though his own convictions seem firmly rooted, he does not offensively obtrude them upon his readers. It would be interesting to have more from him upon the same subject. Dr. Schipper, too, unless he has given up his study of the Old English Bede, doubtless has much to say that scholars would be glad to read.

Much time and great labor have been expended in determining the Old-English text.

"T. was selected as the basis, and its defects supplemented from B. as belonging to the same recension. The text was completed and written out twice. . . . But after repeated collations and careful study of the MSS., it became evident that Bede was an Anglian and not a West-Saxon work, and that the first necessity was to exhibit a text representing as far as possible the Anglian archetype. This led me to discard B., and adopt a 'contamination' of texts founded on T. C. O. Ca. in order of preference."

Dr. Miller rejects MS. B.; for reasons already given, and also Zupitza's leaves from MS. Cott. Dom. A. ix., though he gives numerous variants from B. and one (104, 12) from Z.

"T. has been collated twice throughout. O. has been collated throughout, and twice in those portions used to supplement T. B. has been collated throughout, and twice at the

beginning and end where T. is defective. Smith and Wheelock were collated and the resulting text collated throughout with the MS. Ca. The fragments of C. have been in part collated twice."

Surely no one will complain of lack of industry on the part of the editor; and, however much we might desire a text all from one MS., and, therefore, representing one age and one locality, few will be found who can read Dr. Miller's book and not applaud his judgment in piecing out his text from MSS. representing as nearly as possible the form in which it was first written. The book would have been better adapted to students' use if he had given marginal notes indicating the point where the text passes from one MS. to another, instead of trusting us to foot-notes and the table on p. xxii.

Of the translation little need be said except that it is generally good English, and, therefore, while the more interesting to the general reader into whose hands it may fall, it is so free as to be a little disappointing to the specialist who would have Dr. Miller's views on certain points of syntax. Such an investigator would probably prefer a rendering more like that of Thomson, Miller's only predecessor as a translator, in the 'Whole Works of King Alfred the Great.' In some places, too, Dr. Miller seems to have leaned rather heavily on the Latin text. Thus, on pp. 8-9, "*Dætte se ylca biscof for ðam intingan untrumysse feria gehæfd*," appears as "That the same bishop was detained there from illness," where there is apparent the influence of the corresponding Latin, "*Ut idem causa infirmitatis ibidem detentus*."

There are a few misprints. *Abysgad* appears as *absgyad* (48, 11); *semninga* as *semniga* (178, 25), and probably *Brotene* (12, 5) is for *Breotene*.

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

Selections from Heine's Poems. Edited, with Notes, by HORATIO STEVENS WHITE, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Cornell University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers. 1890. 12mo, v, 220 pp.

PROFESSOR WHITE's recent contribution to

class-room material for the study of German literature might well be chosen as an index of the advance which modern language study has made, both as regards scope and critical character, within the past decade. Not until very recently have American editors ventured to produce for use in advanced classes anything beside masterpieces of writers of the first order. With the limited time accorded to the department, there was scarcely a demand for anything else. The increased recognition that modern literatures have lately been acquiring in our highest institutions has rendered possible a more liberal aim.

The work before us is an attempt to present with some degree of fulness what is characteristic in the poetic activity of a notable author of secondary rank, employing his writings themselves as indices of the various aspects of his extraordinary personality. The body of the work consists of one hundred and sixty-six pages of selections, one hundred and fifty-six numbers, of which the 'Buch der Lieder' furnishes nearly one half (seventy-five), 'Neue Gedichte' twenty-eight, 'Aus Deutschland' eleven, the "Romancero" nineteen, and "Letzte Gedichte" twenty-three. Some of the popular favorites are missing, but in general the choice of material will be approved. Certainly the editor has attained his stated purpose "to present only those poems to which one might wish or be willing to recur." Nothing formally objectionable finds place in the collection. The attitude of the editor towards his author as set forth in the preface is strictly judicial, and at the same time calculated to reassure any timid souls who might doubt that Heine is a wholesome author for extended study.

If now we examine Professor White's literary and critical contribution to the work, we find another source of congratulation in the contrast it offers to the method of the older and not yet extinct generation of annotators. Fruitful scholarship, and especially literary sense,—not the juiceless reproduction of facts,—marks every page; in the terse preface, in the longer "introductory note," which introduces the bibliography of Heine in German, French and English; in the remarks upon the several volumes from which the given poems are selected, and finally in the special notes to the

individual selections. The quality and purpose of these textual notes may be judged from the fact that, of the fifty that accompany the seventy-six selections, from the "Buch der Lieder," only twenty are purely explanatory, while more than half the remaining literary notes are citations of similar themes or thoughts in other poets, national and otherwise. Thus on the 'Lorelei':

"No. 37 is not a legend of long ago, but dates from a ballad of Clemens Brentano in 1802. The same subject was then treated by other poets until finally Heine entered into their various labors, and with a touch of true genius gave to the tale its imperishable form. (Details in S. [Strodtmann] i, 362, 696, 7). A charming rendering in Scotch dialect is found in Macmillan's Magazine, May 1872, p. 24"; and then follow two verses of this version.

Again in the note to No. 156, 'Der Scheidende,' the Odyssey xi, 488-491, is cited from Bryant's translation, reference is made to Ecclesiastes ix, 4., and the student is invited to "compare this poem with No. 130 ('Sie erlischt') and both with Voltaire's 'Adieux à Vie' (1778), written in the last year of his life,"

from which several lines are quoted. Surely literary culture is fostered by editing of this sort. "The Empire of letters" assumes a fuller meaning to one introduced to a foreign poet in this manner.

The appendix, which presents linguistic, syntactical and metrical characteristics, not merely of the poems in this collection, but all Heine's verse, deserves more than passing mention. Beyond its value for reference, it offers a suggestion of how certain authors may be studied by the more serious students in the college *seminar*. Under its four rubrics are assembled:

1. Antiquated, obsolescent or unusual words or forms.
2. Grammatical irregularities.
3. Long or unusual compounds or derivatives.
4. Faulty, dialectic and curious rimes in Heine's verse, alliteration, etc.

To follow through an author's writings with mind alert to collect such facts as are collated in these categories, is a work which might be assigned to as many students, and one which could hardly fail, under the supervision of an efficient leader, to inculcate a sense of the

meaning of "painstaking scholarship." At the same time, we thank Professor White for collecting all such material relating to his selections by itself, rather than involving it with his literary notes, to the detriment of their cultural value, for it may as well be recognized that these details have no especial attractiveness in college classes to any but the more serious students.

As a whole the work¹ may be taken as an exposition in concrete form of Professor White's views as set forth in his paper before the *Modern Language Association of America*, in 1887 (see MOD. LANG. NOTES for June, 1888), and in particular of its closing paragraphs.

CHARLES E. FAY.

Tufts College.

ROMANCE ETYMOLOGY.

Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch von GUSTAV KÖRTING. Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh. 1891. 4to, pp. vi, 414.

THE recent completion of what may be regarded as a first draft of this laborious and useful work, marks a decided advance on all its predecessors in the field of Romance etymology. Since the unheralded appearance of the first sheets, not many months ago, the successive instalments have followed each other with unexampled rapidity, until we have now before us not only the entire vocabulary, but also a full complement of indexes, together with an appendix of additions and corrections.

The all-important 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch' of Diez was as unpractical and inconvenient in the disposition of its rich array of materials (I say *was*, since it is now once for all superseded, for practical ease of reference, by the new 'Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch' of Körting) as it was, in the main, sound and scholarly in its presentation of facts and deduction of conclusions; nor could even the importunity of friends and colleagues of the author prevail upon him to depart, in later editions, from a plan of arrangement entailing annoyance as well as loss of time on those who had occasion to consult its learned pages. Indeed, so intricate was the process of search

for a fugitive vocable in these etymological preserves, that in attempting to follow up the clue one might well have been reminded of the familiar yet tantalizing injunction: "First catch your hare." Worst of all, it was only after patient quest under various rubrics that the student could discover whether any given word was even treated of at all, and it was not until the publication of Jarnik's complete index to Diez—of which a second, improved edition appeared shortly before the first instalment of Körting—that scholars felt themselves possessed of a ready and infallible key to all the treasures of the work.

The plan of Körting's dictionary, on the contrary, is a happy innovation. For the primary idea of it, apparently, and for a collection of highly important material, he is indebted to Gröber's articles in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, entitled "Vulgärlateinische Substrata romanischer Wörter," while the bulk of the new dictionary is furnished by a justifiable appropriation of the entire body of Diez's results, so far as these continue to stand the scientific tests of recent years. At the head of each article is set, in bold-face type, the Latin (or other) etymon of the Romance word or groups of words. Each article, moreover, is numbered, a device which greatly promotes ease and accuracy of cross-reference and of index-making. A peculiar merit of the plan is that all categories of words are ranged under one general vocabulary, thus saving a world of trouble in the everyday manipulation of the book.¹

There is, however, lacking in the vocabulary

¹ This—the one-vocabulary—feature of the work has been made the occasion of criticism in a recent notice (*Romania* xix, 637-38): "N'aurait-il pas mieux valu faire pour chacune des langues non latines (sauf quand les mots qui en viennent avaient passé au latin avant la chute de l'Empire) un lexique à part, comme l'a fait M. Jarnik dans ses index de Diez?" By no means. Make, in addition to a complete general index to your one all-inclusive vocabulary, as many special indexes as may be called for; but let the multiplying of vocabularies in such a work as this be forevermore tabooed. Incredible as it may sound to those who have never been annoyed by it, the *Table générale* to the first ten volumes of the *Romania* consists of no less than eight separate reference vocabularies, and to assist in turning to any desired one of these there is neither a page-reference in the table of contents, nor even—what is still more aggravating—an appropriate running-title at the head of the pages. It would be curious to know whether the compiler of the *Table générale* is also the author of the *Romania* critique on Körting's dictionary. In any case, the *Table générale* to the second ten volumes will soon be due, and it is sincerely to be hoped, that if the multiple-vocabulary system is to be retained in the compilation of it, there will at least be added a table of contents with page-references, and with running-titles through the body of the index.

one feature, which, though it would involve considerable additional labor, might advantageously be introduced into later editions, viz., the classification under a single etymon of all the derivatives and compounds of that etymon, after the manner of Bréal's 'Dictionnaire étymologique latin,' or of Skeat's 'Etymological Dictionary.' As the result of such a classification, many inconsistencies, contradictions and repetitions at present existing in Körting's dictionary, would necessarily be eliminated, or at any rate instructively confronted. Even where such inconsistencies are of minor importance, they detract from the tone of accuracy and authority appropriate to a scientific work. Thus, under No. 139, it is stated that, according to Scheler, "*AD-APTIO ist vielleicht Grundwort zu prov. *adaptir* . . . und mittelbar altfrz. *a-atir* (Vb. zu dem Adj. *ate*)"; while under No. 143 AD-AT-IO is given as etymon of O. Fr. *aatir*, and we are told that "prov. *adaptir* hat mit AD-ATIRE nichts zu schaffen." (In addition to AD-APTIO, we have separate articles for AD-APTUS, APTO and APTUS).—The etymology of Fr. *aïse* is discussed under AD-ATIO (142), ANSA, and ASIUM.—No. 437, *allumer* is derived from AL-LUMINARE, while at 769 it is said to be formed from LUMEN, and at 4923 it is given under LUMINO.—No verbal etymon is introduced for *acabar*, *achever*, these words being appropriately treated under CAPUM (=CAPUT); yet an etymon *AR-ROSO is set up for *arroser*, although we are expressly told (769) that the latter is derived from *ros*, as *a-cab-ar* is from *cab*.

For an example of the extent to which neglect of editing can be carried, compare 3918 with 3940. It will be worth while to quote these numbers entire.

3918) ndl. HEER, mhd. nhd. HERR,=frz. (*pauvre*) *hère*, armer Schlucker, vgl. Dz. 614 s.v. Förster, Z. iii, 262, erkennt in *hère* das altfrz. (bezüglich seiner Herkunft ganz dunkle) Sbst. *here* f., welches "Gesicht" u. "Aufnahme" zu bedeuten scheint, vergl. dagegen G. Paris, R. viii, 628. S. No. 3941 [read 3940].

3940) [mhd. HERR=frz. *hère* in *pauvre hère*, armer Kerl: vgl. Dz. 614 s. v.; Förster, Z. iii, 262, glaubt, dass *hère* u. altfrz. *here*, Gesicht, dasselbe Wort seien, wogegen G. Paris, R. viii, 629 [read 628], berechnigte Einwände erhoben hat. S. No. 3918].

Are time and space so little valuable that

there should be room for two such articles on the same page? So, one and the same group of words is recorded under ALMOSINA (453) and ELEEMOSYNA (2796), naturally without cross-references.—Cornu shows conclusively, *Rom.* xi, 91, that Port. *hortem* is from AD NOCTEM. Diez's etymon ANTE-DIEM (598) should accordingly be relegated to a mere mention under AD NOCTEM (220). A preference for Cornu's etymon over that of Diez is expressed under HERI (3397). Port. *anthontem* and Spanish *anlyer* are mentioned under 480, but their respective etyma (ANTE HERI and ANTE-AD-NOCTEM) are not entered.—For useless repetition or inconsistency, compare 239 and 4400; 261 and 3839; 847 and 7921; 3705 and 4284; 4424 and 8778; 6372 and 8627; 7584, 7604 and 7891.—For erroneous treatment of compounds, cf. Fr. *avenir*, which is referred directly to AD-VENIO, whereas it is a compound of *à venir*. Again, the French adverb *maintenant* is referred, at least apparently, to *maintenir*, while it is really a compound of *main* and *tenant*.

When we come to the subject of omissions, the field is a broad one, and the *Nachtrag*, while offering many additions, has scarcely made an appreciable inroad into the outlying regions. I will insert here, first, a few etyma which might naturally have found a place in the dictionary, and secondly a number of additions to the articles as they stand:

ARBORETA, O. Fr. *arbroie*.

BONA HORA, O. Fr. *buer*.

CALCEAMENTA, O. Fr. *chaucemente*.

CONFESSUS, Fr. *confès*, etc.

EX-PERDERE, O. Fr. *esperdre* (cf. Mod. Fr. *éperdu*).

EX-TONITRUS, Span. *estruendo* (O.Sp. *atruendo*), Port. *estrondo*.

GÊRO (O.H.G.). Ital. *gherone*, Fr. *giron*, etc. (cf. Diez, p. 161).

HARTJAN (O. H. G.). Fr. *hardi*, etc.

HONESTAS, O. Fr. *honesté*.

HORRIDITAS, O. Fr. *ordeé*.

HOSTIA, O. Fr. *oïste* (cf. Mod. Fr. *hostie*).

JUVENTA, O. Fr. *jovente*.

MALA HORA, O. Fr. *mare* (*mar*).

MALUM ANNUM, Ital. *malanno* (Purg. xi, 69); O. Pr. *malan*.

METUS, Span. *miedo* (whence *medroso*).

MISSATICUS, O. Fr. *message* (=messenger).

PERMAGNUS, O. Fr. *parmainz*.
 PHYSICA, O. Fr. *fisicle* (cf. *bouticle*, *boutique*).
 POLIPUS, Mod. Fr. *pieuvre*.
 PRAEDICARE, Fr. *prêcher*.
 RIDICULARE, Fr. *rigoler*.
 RIPARIUM, O. Fr. *rivier*.
 ROGATIO, O. Fr. *rovoison*, *rovaison*.
 RUBOR, O. Fr. *rovor*, *roor*.
 SUBMONERE, Fr. *semondre*.
 SUCCURRERE, O. Fr. *secorre*.
 SUSCIPERE, O. Pr. *soisebre*.

The above are merely incidentally noted omissions. Their number could be indefinitely increased. So, too, might additions or annotations, almost without limit, be made to the existing articles. The following small contribution may seem worth recording:

265. Add Span. *Gil*.
 276. "Vgl. unten **robigula*." But no **robigula* is given.
 360. Add O. Prov. *albhorn*; Span. *albur*; O. Ital. *albor*.
 437. Add Ital. *allumare*.
 674. " Span. *maniatar*.
 732. " to Eng. *alarum* the form *alarm*.
 767. Cf. *Rom.* vi, 201.
 780. "Am wahrscheinlichsten aber ist die baskische Herkunft des Wortes." But no Basque etymon is given.
 807. Add Prov. *áz*, *aze*.
 828. " O. Prov. *azegar*.
 850. For development of meaning in *assommer*, cf. Scheler, s. v. *tuer*.
 991. Add Span. *baúl*.
 1042. " Prov. *batejar*.
 1092. " Prov. *bauzia*.
 1117. " O. Fr. *beneïçon* (cf. *maldeçon*, *mal-eïçon*).
 1348. Add Prov. *bisa*, *biza*.
 1484. " Prov. *caumelhs*.
 1605. " O. Fr. *cavestre*.
 1636. Under CAPUM should be ranged *meschever* (formed like *achever*, see above), from which *mêchef* is the verbal noun—whereas MINUS CAPUT (5317) is set up as etymon. Here also should be entered Fr. *rechef*, Prov. *rescap*.
 1716. Add O. Fr. *castel*.
 1962. " O. Prov. *agag*, 'embuscade.'
 1977. " O. Fr. *quisinaire*.
 2046. " O. Fr. *compaigne*.

2343. Add O. Fr. *covir*.
 2537. " O. Prov. *destrics*.
 2818. " 13. INDE-ARE. (Cf. *Romania*, xviii, 519).
 3100. Add Span. *fecha*.
 3274. " *FINO, -ARE (v. *fîn-* für FÎNI-) enden." O. Fr. *finer* is better regarded as a denominal from *fîn*.
 3276. Add O. Fr. *fermetez*.
 3413. " O. and Mod. Fr. *fossé*.
 3487. " O. Fr. *fuie*.
 3580. " O. Prov. *gallinier*.
 3652. " O. Prov. *gensar*.
 3670. " Span. *jayan*, and *dele* "Das Wort ist also nur in den gallischen Sprachen volksthümlich."
 3935. Add O. Fr. *iretê*.
 4170. " O. Prov. *enquansa*.
 4433. " (IPSIMUM) O. Fr. *isme* (Clédât, 'Morceaux Choisis,' p. 171, l. 13).
 4440. Add O. Fr. *errauement* (beside *erranment*). Perhaps influenced by such words as *léauement*, *espéciaument*.
 4454. Cf. Gaston Paris, *Rom.* xv, 453: "Il vaut mieux s'en tenir à JAM MAGIS."
 4474. Add O. Fr. *juesdis*.
 4478. " Span. *juzgo* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, 'Grammaire' i, § 338: "*juez* à côté de *juzgo* est un ancien nominatif.")
 4587. Add O. Fr. *crepon* (Diez, s. v. *groppo*).
 4872. " (from Diez, s. v. *loco*): "Sp. *luego*, pg. *logo* . . . altfr. *luec*, *lues* . . . zeitadverb, *statim*."—For the phonology of *lieu*, add to the references, G. Paris, *Rom.* xvii, 623.
 4920. Add O. Fr. *lun*.
 4980. " O. Fr. *maît*.
 4984. Cf. Purg. xix, 63, *le ruote magne*.
 5002. " O. Span. *desmalinrar*.
 5049. Add O. Fr. *main*, *main*s, adv., and compare *main*s, Tobler, 'Verm. Beitr.' p. 71.
 5056. Add O. Fr. *mange*.
 5219. " Fr. *méringue* (?).
 5310. " O. Fr. *meneur* (acc.).
 5459. " O. Fr. *moillier*.
 5476. " 'wirklich.'
 5581. " to Fr. *nier*, O. Fr. verbal noun *ni* (cf. *déni*).
 5648. Add O. Prov. *noel*.
 5751. Fr. *houppelande* has aspirate *h*, which makes it probable that it is not of Latin origin, unless influenced by *houppe*.

- 5995^a. (Nachtrag). Add O. Fr. *poire*.
 6360. Add O. Fr. *prestre, provoire* (cf. *rue des Provoires*).
 6545. Add meaning 'doch' (with imperative).
 6715. Fr. *racheter* is to be referred to *RE-AD-CAPTO, not to RE-CAPTO.
 6826. Add Fr. *repère* (in *point de repère*), which is only another mode of spelling *repaire*.
 6835. Add O. Fr. *repondre* (not to be confounded with Mod. Fr. *répondre*).
 6901. Add O. Fr. *revisder*.
 7018. Fr. *bruire* is referred to *BRAGIRE (1314), but there *bruire* is not mentioned.
 7424. Add O. Fr. *servise*.
 7646. " O. Fr. *esperne* [cf. Eng. *épergne*, in sense of Mod. Fr. *surtout (de table)*].
 7671. Add O. Fr. *espoir*, 'perhaps.'
 8124. " " " *terremuete*.
 8339. " " " *crieme* ('*crainte*').
 8356. " " " *trecier*.
 8375. " " " *tristre*.
 8483. Cf. 178: "Prov. u. altfrz. *anc, ainc* rtr. *ounc* dürften auf *umquam* zurückgehen."
 8524. Meyer-Lübke derives Fr. *outil* from *USITILE (Gram. § 351).
 8628. Add O. Fr. *verai*.
 8639. " O. Fr. *verté, vretté*.
 8698. " O. Prov. *ve* (in *vec*), Fr. *voi* in *voilà*.
 8765. Fr. *visiter* is a *mot savant*. The semi-popular form is O. Fr. *viseter*, the popular form O. Fr. *visder*.

The most important failure to utilize accessible materials is perhaps the omission of all reference to Rausch's long and useful list of Ræ-tian etymologies in his article on the "Müser-krieg," Gröber's *Zeitschrift*, vol. ii. Gaston Paris's review of Caix's 'Studii,' *Rom.* viii, with numerous etymological notes of importance, seems likewise to have been overlooked. In general, the enormous labor of gleaning the entire field of etymological literature has been fairly well accomplished, but would need to be more systematically and strenuously conducted for a second edition.

In a work of this kind, absolute typographical accuracy—so peculiarly essential—is extraordinarily difficult of attainment. In the present instance, the efforts of author and publisher to this end are highly creditable. Most of the

errors which have escaped correction in the "Nachtrag zum romanischen Wortverzeichnis," are comparatively unimportant.² The following may be not noted (references are to number of article).

O. Fr. *arvir*, the omission of which under 695 is apologized for in the "Vorbemerkung," is not given in the appendix.

167, l. 4, read DUBBA.

303, 9, read (719).

613, 8, " *sordéis*.

842, 13, " **assufficere*.

854, 1, " *-mätis*.

929. No derivative is given.

932, 5, read *aucella*.

932, 11, " *avis*.

939, 2, *abád* is everywhere else spelt *abad*.

970, 6, read *ndd*.

1296, 1, read *ahd*.

1583 should stand after 1576.

1723, 7, read Morel-Fatio.

2210, 9, *dele* dazu das Vbsbst. *courroux*. (It is repeated where it belongs, in the next line).

2580, 4, read *délayer*.

2775 should stand after 2756.

2788 and 2789 should exchange places.

3005, 9, read *escuadra*. But the statement is incorrect; Span. has also *escuadron*, and other derivatives.

8358 should stand after 8355.

8397^a (Nachtrag), "vgl. Foerster, Z. 537" (what volume?).

In the Index, Fr. *père* is omitted (5943), and *ornière* (5760). *Fincar* should be referred to 3234, moule to 5349. In their alphabetical places, read *houppelande, terremuoto*. Under *pizarra* add 712, and suppress *pizzara* lower down. *Balar* stands after *balenare*.

A word may be added as to the general scope of the vocabulary. Prof. Körting has been fortunately liberal in the admission of loan-word etyma. In this direction, he has gone much further than Diez, yet there is still ample room for the exercise of his good intention. Thus, while we find recorded Eng. RIDING COAT (Fr. *redingote*), and even AUNT SALLY (Fr. *le jeu de l'âne salé*), place has not

² Instead of making out a separate list of *errata*, the editor has simply introduced the erroneous word in its correct form in the "Nachtrag zum roman. Wortverzeich."

been made for BEEFSTEAK (*bifteck*), BULL-DOG (*bouledogue*), BOWLING GREEN (*boulingrin*), or PUDDING (*pouding*). While we find BRING DIR'S (Ital. *brindisi*, Fr. *brinde*), HABERSACK (*havresac*), and TRINKEN (Fr. *trinquen*), we look in vain for SAUERKRAUT (*choucrouste*), EIDERDAUN (*édredon*) and WAS IST DAS? (*vasistas*).

An especially striking omission is that of all discussion of the numerous etyma advanced for O. Fr. *aoi*! of the 'Chanson de Roland.'

But enough has been written to justify the designation of this admirable work, in its present condition, as a "first draft." It will undoubtedly pass rapidly to a second edition, when we may confidently look for great things in the way of additions and improvements.

H. A. TODD.

Leland Stanford Junior Univ.

GERMAN SLANG.

Deutsches Slang. Eine Sammlung familiärer Ausdrücke und Redensarten, zusammengestellt von ARNOLD GENTHE. Strassburg: K. I. Trübner, 1892.

MR. GENTHE gives us in eighty-eight pages an Introduction on German slang, and an alphabetical list of about fifteen hundred slang expressions, together with their respective German literary equivalents and, in many cases, accompanied by an illustration. Here are two examples:

Blech, n., Unsinn; z. B. redet doch nicht solches Blech!

Flezen, v. refl., sich fleigelhaft hinsetzen, hinlegen: er flezt sich aufs Sopha.

As the author assures us, his collection does not contain any merely provincial slang, but only such as is used in society all over the German Empire; namely, the general slang, which within the last two decades, has had a most luxuriant growth, so that a native German who, after a twenty years' absence, returning home, feels like a stranger.

As the chief tributaries of this stately river of German slang, the following are pointed out:

1. Dialectic elements; and here it is the Low-German dialect (Plattdeutsch), the idiom of the popular F. Reuter, that has made the largest contribution, a fact that is easily ex-

plained by the geographical site of the capital of the German Empire.

2. Such High-German words as, in addition to their literary meaning, have received a secondary one, bearing the stamp of slang; for example, *Pech*, 'pitch,' in slang means 'ill luck,' so that 'ich hatte Pech' precisely answers to the slang phrase 'I had hard luck.'

3. New words. Of these the greater part are entirely German in their make-up. *Vertrommeln*, for example, has *Trommel*, 'drum,' for its stem, *ver-* for a prefix, and *-n* for a suffix. 'Jemanden vertrommeln' means 'to thrash some one, to give him a good drumming.'

But there are also several that contain foreign elements, usually in their endings. Thus *schauderös* (*-ös*=French *-eux, -euse*) 'schauderhaft'; *Dicktütude* 'Dicke'; *knappemang* (*-mang*=French *-ment*) 'knapp,' used adverbially; *ein Dickus*, 'ein Dicker.'

Others, again, are onomatopoeitic; for example, *quurksen*, which expresses the sound produced by a person walking in wet shoes.

Finally, there are new words of entirely arbitrary coinage, coming mostly out of the ever busy mint of the German university. A German student before his examination has not 'Angst,' but 'Bammel,' and when dunned by his creditors, he does not make any 'Ausflüchte,' but 'Menkenke.'

The usefulness of this slang vocabulary, the purpose of which is chiefly a practical one, is obvious. It answers a great many questions which none of the literary dictionaries answer, and is quite indispensable to every reader of the modern German comedy and other comic writers, where slang is at home and constantly gaining ground. But still better service will it do to the foreigner, who is learning the German language conversationally among the Germans at home. For the familiar conversation of the average German, even in the best classes of society, is full of slang, and the learner is quite liable to mistake slang expressions for literary ones and to use them unseasonably. The most ludicrous slips have in this way been made by perfectly innocent and well-meaning strangers, and spicy anecdotes abound.

For a second edition we would suggest to the author that the usefulness of his book may be

increased by a still more liberal supply of illustrations, as the mere literary equivalent of a slang term is often insufficient to show its exact and peculiar use.

We feel well assured that the little book, cleverly and judiciously compiled as it is, will make for itself many warm friends.

H. C. O. HUSS.

Princeton College.

FRENCH TRAGEDY.

Sénèque et Hardy. Dissertation présentée à la Faculté de Philosophie de l'Université de Leipzig par JULES BÉRANECK. Leipzig: Ferdinand Bär. 1890, pp. 27.

Mr. BÉRANECK'S dissertation is, as he informs us, only part of his original thesis entitled: "Sénèque et la tragédie classique jusqu'au xviii^e siècle." We find no direct reference made as to how far the author carried his investigation, nor does the manner of treatment suggest any definite limit. Why Hardy should be included is not quite clear, as his literary career belongs altogether to the seventeenth century. Yet whether this is the closing chapter of the thesis or not, it cannot be said that any tangible and convincing results have been reached. The author evidently has undertaken to cover too much ground in a field hitherto but little explored.

The influence of the Spanish and Italian drama is briefly sketched (pp. 1-6); two pages only are devoted to Hardy's predecessors; the rest is taken up by the main subject, the scanty results being divided into four sections:

1. Mots et Expressions.
2. Artifices de Style.
3. Scènes et Situations.
4. Remarques générales.

The last paragraph contains a notice, under a rather misleading heading, of the indirect influence exerted through Garnier and Jodelle; nothing new or important, however, is presented. This view, together with some remarks on Hardy's indebtedness to Garnier, ought to have been made the starting point of the discussion; such an arrangement would have prevented the writer from magnifying Seneca's influence, which is not so strong and palpable as he would seem to think.—In the

bibliography on Hardy, we miss a notice of C. Nagel's publication in *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, No. xxviii.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANGLO-SAXON *giēn*, *giēna*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the London *Academy*, Dec. 19, 1891, Prof. Hempl published an explanation of the A.-S. *giēn giēna*, (*gēn*, *gēna*) and *giēt*, *giēta* (*gēt*, *gēta*). According to Prof. Hempl each word is a compound of the Germanic *in*+ demonstr. pron. *hin*- (masc.) or *hit*- (neut.) Germanic *in-hinō* > Wessex **gēhin*, *giēna*; non-Wessex **gēhin*, *gēn* or **gēohin* [*gēon*], *gēona*. Germanic *in-hitō* > *giēt*, *gēt*, *gēot*.

Without committing myself for the present to any opinion upon the *giēt* series, I should like to express my doubts at least upon the *giēn* series.

True, Sievers, § 317, gives the form *giēna*. But on what authority? I am reluctant to put on the air of challenging so eminent an investigator, for I know personally that his brilliant generalizations are based upon data collected with infinite pains. Nevertheless, I should like to know what genuine Wessex texts contain the form *giēn*, or *giēna*. I have not a single instance of the Wessex use of the word, nor can I find any in the dictionaries. The word is not cited by Cosijn, for I have a complete alphabetical list of all the words mentioned by him in his treatment of the vowels, Part I. Earle does not give it in his Glossary to the 'Chronicle,' nor does Sweet give it in any shape in his 'O. E. T.' By consulting Bouterwek's Glossary to the Northumbrian Gospels and examining the corresponding passages in the other texts printed by Skeat, I find, only *gen*, *Matt.* xix. 20 R¹, and this Rushworth is Mercian.

The word is not in the Wright-Wülker Glossaries nor in Aelfric's Grammar, pp. 222-242, on adverbs (Zupitza). Bosworth-Toller cite *giēn* *Gen.* 2741, *Gen.* 2195, *Juliana* 417, to which add *gina*, *Elene* 1071. The absence of the word from Wessex texts leads me, then, to infer that

the word is confined to Northern speech. Hence we have no right use a Wessex **gïen* (**gïena*) in support of the above theory.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

NEGRO-ENGLISH.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—May I enter a mild protest against the serio-comic view which a recent writer in *Anglia* takes of Mrs. Stowe's knowledge of Negro-English in our South?

P. Grade, in an article entitled "Das Neger-Englisch an der Westküste von Afrika," makes my study of "Negro-English" (*Anglia*, vii, 1884) largely the basis of an extended inquiry into the linguistic phenomena that have grown up among the English-speaking tribes of Togo and the Camervons. While I have not the least objection to the very flattering use to which he puts my collections and observations in the course of his inquiry, it is rather a shock to one's nerves to have 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' constantly cited in illustration of American Negro usage, phonetics, and philology. The fifty pages of my study, such as it is,—and it does not profess to be 'scientific,'—were based upon lifelong residence in the South in many different states; and where my own experience failed me I called in constantly the help of born Southerners who had thrown into literary form their reminiscences of the negro.

May I, *en passant*, call the attention of the American Dialect Society to this most interesting field of research, before it is obliterated by the advancing school-ma'am?

JAMES A. HARRISON.

Washington and Lee University.

KENTS' CYNEWULF'S "ELENE."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG NOTES.

SIRS:—As I was recently reading Cynewulf's "Elene" in Prof. Kent's edition (Ginn & Co., 1889) I was struck with his interpretation of ll. 348-9, "*panon ic ne wende œfre tō aldre onston mīne*," From that time (see *panan* in glossary) "I never turned my face to life, i. e., to the things of this life." Might it not be better rendered, "Thence (i. e., from God) I shall

never turn my face for ever"? "Tō aldre" would, if so translated, simply strengthen "œfre" and mean, forever. For this use compare "Judith" l. 120, "Béowulf" ll. 956, 2006, 2499. This is also more in accordance with the passage of the Bible referred to, Ps. xvi, 8, "I shall not be moved." To l. 353 Kent makes a query "Where does Essaias make this prophecy"? Ll. 353-363 are a paraphrase of Isaiah I, 2, 3, and the Latin at the bottom of the page gives those two verses, with the exception of one word, verbatim from the Vulgate.

W. M. TWEEDIE.

Mt. Allison College, Sackville, N. B.

TRAINSTEAD.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In his book on the English language, Prof. Lounsbury speaks of the self-explaining compounds which were so numerous in the Anglo-Saxon, but which are seldom coined in its lineal descendant, our own tongue. Many were lost during the Middle English period by the substitution of Latin words. The compound *sunnen-stede* was used in Early English to denote the place where the sun seems to stop, both in Cancer and in Capricorn. Had it not been lost it would have been *sunstead*, but it was supplanted by *solstice* (*solstitium*), which remains in use to this day. There are a number of words in modern English which are compounded of the Anglo-Saxon *stede*. Of these, *bedstead* and *homestead* are everywhere used. *Roadstead* (*ridan*, to ride, and *stede*) is in common use on the sea coast, though seldom heard elsewhere. Three others are *steadfast*, *steady* and *instead*. Now if it is allowable to go back to the Anglo-Saxon for a word when other sources have failed to give us an exact one, we can do so with advantage in the following case: there is a diversity of opinion as to the word we should use to designate the place where the train stops. For many years we have used *depot*, an importation from the French. The French people themselves use *debarcation* and more frequently *gare* while *depot* with them means a storehouse. It is misused when applied to the place where the train stops. *Station* (*statio*) is

growing in favor, but it does not define completely, and to be understood we must say railroad station. Why not rid ourselves of the difficulty by making a compound,—*trainstead*? Train is from the French, but "stead" is good Saxon; we are perfectly familiar with both, and together they make a name that defines perfectly.

C. LAURON HOOPER.

Ohio University.

BRIEF MENTION.

The *Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek*, which has been undertaken by the firm of Max Niemeyer (Halle), under the direction of competent editors, promises many interesting publications in the field of comparative literature, particularly in that which touches on the favorite epics of mediæval France and Germany. The first number of the Bibliothek is Are's "Íslendingabók," edited by Wolfgang Golther. The editor introduces the text by chapters on Are's life, works, his literary significance and the previous edition of this particular treatise. Then follows the text with abundant footnotes, appendices which discuss further questions concerning Are and his writings, a chronological table and an Index of proper names. pp. xxviii, 49, 8vo. Price 1 m., 60 pf.

In 'Les Précieuses Ridicules; comédie en un acte' par J. B. P. Molière, with introduction and notes by Eugène Fasnacht, London and New York, Macmillan and Co., 1891, the editor has added another number to his series of well-edited French plays. The Introduction (pp. i, xxxii) contains a short biography of Molière, and remarkably well-selected extracts from the writings of Sainte-Beuve, Paul de Saint-Victor, Mlle. Desjardins and Nisard, illustrative of the curious phase of society which Molière's comedy satirizes. The Notes (pp. 35-70) are good and give the information which is indispensable to a correct appreciation of the little comedy. These notes are followed by an Appendix, containing

"a list of the most striking 'phrases précieuses' in the order in which they occur in this play."

An Index to the notes facilitates reference, while at the same time it enables the student to gain a comprehensive view of the peculiarities of the play.

The publishing firm of G. J. Göschen, in Stuttgart, will hereafter publish *Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte*. It is intended that the new serial shall not give a mere bibliography or criticisms of the more important publications in the line of literary history, but shall give, each year, a complete survey of all that has been added to our knowledge of the history of German literature from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. Among those who have promised to contribute are, M. Bernays, J. Baechtold, J. Bolte, W. Creizenach, G. Ellinger, L. Geiger, L. Hirzel, B. Litzmann, J. Minor, F. Muncker, K. C. Redlich, A. Reifferscheid, M. Rödiger, G. Roethe, A. Sauer, E. Schmidt, E. Schröder, P. Strauch, M. v. Waldberg, R. M. Werner, and others. Dr. J. Elias will edit the material bearing upon the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries; Dr. M. Hermann and Dr. S. Szamatólski that bearing upon the fifteenth, sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.

Two parts of the fifth edition of Kluge's 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache' have appeared. This new edition differs from the preceding one chiefly in giving greater prominence to dialect words and forms and in including a much greater number of words borrowed from other languages later than the sixteenth century. The material is thus considerably increased, covering as far as *Frosch*, one hundred and twenty pages, as compared with ninety-six pages in the fourth edition; the price is to remain the same.

PERSONAL.

In the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) Dr. Morton W. Easton, Professor of Comparative Philology, has been placed in charge of the courses in English Philology and Old-English, and Assistant Professor Felix E. Schelling has been promoted to the chair of Professor of English Literature.

Dr. Henry Logeman, of the University of Ghent, Belgium, in association with Dr. Boer and Dr. Hettema, has established a new periodical for the study of the Teutonic Languages and Dialects. Messrs Brill & Co. of Leiden are to be the publishers, and the first number of the new publication is to appear soon.

Professor Clarence C. Freeman (Southwestern University, Jackson, Tenn.) has been elected Professor of English at Kentucky University (Lexington, Ky.). He will begin the duties of his new office in February.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITTERATUREN. LXXXVII. BAND, 2. U. 3. HEFT.—*Abhandlungen.*—**Leitzmann, Albert**, Beiträge zur Kenntnis Georg Forsters aus ungedruckten Quellen. (Fortsetzung).—**Strohmeyer, Hans**, Das Verhältnis der Handschriften der Reimchronik Roberts von Gloucester.—**Foerster, W.**, Zum Beaudous Roberts von Blois.—**Kleine Mitteilungen.—**Hager, Herman**, Joseph Green Cogswells Beziehungen zu Goethe.—**von Waldeck, Meyer, Friedrich**, Die Memoiren des Marschalls von Bassompierre und Goethes Unterhaltungen der Ausgewanderten.—**Napier, A. S.**, Bruchstücke einer altenglischen Evangelienhandschrift.—**Napier, A. S.**, Eine weitere Fassung des me. Gedichts *Worldes blis ne last no throwe*.—**Holthausen, F.**, Zu Chaucers Cécilienlegende.—**Stengel, E.**, Kollation des Originalabdrucks von Bezas Traktat *De francica lingua recta pronuntiatione* mit A. Toblers Neuausgabe.—**Tobler, Adolf**, Nachtrag zu Archiv lxxxvi, 442, Anm.—*Beurteilungen und kurze Anzeigen.*—**Ellinger, G.**, C. Reuling, Die komische Figur in den wichtigsten deutschen Dramen bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts.—**Bolte, J.**, Die jüngere Glosse zum Reinke de Vos, hrsgb. von Herman Brandes.—**Ellinger, G.**, Johannes Reutsch, Johann Elias Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Gottsched.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Sämtliche poetische Werke von J. B. Uz. Hrsgb. von A. Sauer.—**Doering, A.**, Wilhelm Cosack, Materialien zu Gotthold Ephraim Lessings Hamburgischer Dramaturgie. Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage.—**Palm, R.**, German Classics edited with English Notes, etc. by C. A. Buchheim.—**Mueller, Ad.**, Muret, Encyclopæd. Wörterbuch der engl. u. deutschen Sprache.—**Mangold, W.**, Otto Kares, Methodical Hints for Speaking English, following closely the lines of instruction indicated by each separate lesson of Degenhardt's Lehrgang der Engl. Sprache. First Series, Part I. Lesson 1-34.—**Z., J.**, The Works of William Shakspeare. Edited with Critical Notes and Introductory Notices by W. Wagner and L. Præscholdt.—**Palm, R.**, Julius Cæsar by William Shakspeare. Students' Tauchnitz Edition. Mit deutschen Erklärungen von Dr. Immanuel Schmidt.—**Schlick, Joseph**, Über Titus Andronicus. Zur Kritik der neuesten Shakspeareforschung von Dr. M. M. Arnold Schröder.—**Gloede, O.**, H. Beyer, Edward Moore. Sein Leben und seine dram. Werke.—**Z., J.**, A Winter's Tale. By Mary E. Mann.—**Z., J.**, A Maiden Fair to See. By F. Phillips and C. J. Wills.—**Z., J.**, Kirsteen. The Story of a Scotch Family seventy Years ago. By Mrs. Oliphant.—**Z., J.**, The Duchess. A Story. By Mrs. Hungerford.—**Z., J.**, The Hired Baby with other Stories and Social Sketches. By Marie Corelli.—**Z., J.**, Khaled. A Tale of Arabia. By F. Marion Crawford.—**Z., J.**, Eight Days. By R. E. Forrest.—**Z., J.**, Sunny Stories and Some Shady Ones. By James Payn.—**Z., J.**, Recha. By Dorothea Gerard.—**Z., J.**, Noughts and Crosses. Stories, Studies and Sketches. By Q.—**Z., J.**, New Grub Street. A Novel. By George Gissing.—**Z., J.**, Extenuating Circumstances, a Novel; and A French Marriage, a Novel. By F. C. Phillips.—**Z., J.**, The Blacksmith of Voe. A Novel. By Paul Cushing.—**Z., J.**, Winchester Meads in the Time of Thomas Ken, D. D., sometime Bishop of**

Bath and Wells. By Emma Marshall.—**Z., J.**, The Smuggler's Secret. A Romance. By Frank Barrett.—**Z., J.**, A Scarlet Sin. By Florence Marryat.—*Misadventure.* By W. E. Norris.—**Z., J.**, The Light of Asia; or, The Great Renunciation. Being the Life and Teaching of Gautama, Prince of India and Founder of Buddhism (as told in Verse by an Indian Buddhist). By Sir Edwin Arnold.—**Z., J.**, Micah Clarke his Statement as made to his three Grandchildren Joseph, Gervas, and Reuben during the Hard Winter of 1734. By A. Conan Doyle.—**Z., J.**, More Social Veissitudes. By F. C. Phillips.—**Z., J.**, Letters from High Latitudes: being some Account of a Voyage, in 1856, in the Schooner Yacht 'Foam' to Iceland, Jan Mayen, and Spitzbergen. By the Earl of Dufferin.—**Z., J.**, Not Like Other Girls. A Novel. By Rosa Nouchette Carey.—**Z., J.**, Donald Ross of Heimra. By William Black.—**Z., J.**, Prisoners and Captives. By Henry Seton Merriman.—**Z., J.**, A Grong of Noble Dames. By Thomas Hardy.—**Z., J.**, Won by Waiting. By Edna Lyall.—**Sprenger, Robert**, Thomas Naogeorgus Pammachius herausgegeben von Johannes Bolte und Erich Schmidt.—**Tobler, Adolf**, E. Étienne, La Langue française depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du XI. siècle. Tome premier. Phonétique, déclinaison, conjugaison.—**Tobler, Adolf**, Ein altfranzösisches Marienlob aus einer Pariser Handschrift des 13. Jahrhunderts zum ersten Mal herausgeg. von Hugo Andresen.—**Tobler, Adolf**, Chansons Populaires de la France. A Selection from French Popular Ballads edited with Introduction and Notes by Th. Fred. Crane.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Leitfaden für den ersten Unterricht im Französischen. Unter Benutzung von 'Hölzels Wandbildern für den Anschauungsunterricht' und mit Aufgaben zum Selbstkonstruieren durch die Schüler. Von S. Alge.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Lesebuch für den franz. Unterricht auf der unteren u. mittleren Stufe höherer Lehranstalten zur Einführung in Land, Art und Geschichte des fremden Volkes von Dr. Hans Rahn. Ausg. f. Mädchenschulen.—**Sarrazin, J.**, A. Ricard, Manuel d'histoire de la littérature française, résumé encyclopédique à l'usage des maisons d'éducation et des aspirants au diplôme de professeurs (*sic!*) de français. 4. édition revue et augmentée.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Athalie. Tragédie Tirée de l'Écriture Sainte 1691. Par J. Racine. Herausgegeben von Dr. Hermann Holfeld.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Histoire de la Révolution française depuis 1788 jusqu'en 1814. Par Mignet. Herausgeg. von G. Tiede. Teil I.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Thérèse ou la petite Sœur de Charité par A.-E. de Saintes. Herausgeg. von B. Klatt.—**Speyer, Fr.**, Neun Erzählungen aus Lettres de mon Moulin und Contes choisis par Daudet. Herausgeg. von Dr. J. Wychgram.—**Braunholtz, E.**, 'Sirventes joglaresc.' Ein Blick auf das altfranzösische Spielmannsleben. Von Friedrich Witthoeft.—**T., A.**, Dr. L. Cerebotani, Vorwort zu dem sechs bis acht Oktavbände starken druckfertigen Werke: Der Organismus und die Ästhetik der klassisch-italienischen Sprache nebst einem reichhaltigen Sprachpromptuarium für jedes Konzept nach den besten Klassikern elukubriert.—**Parisselle, E.**, G. A. Scartazzini, Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia. Introduzione allo studio di Dante Alighieri e delle sue Opere.—**Buchholtz, H.**, L'Alighieri, Rivista di cose dantesche diretta da F. Pasqualigo.—**Buchholtz, H.**, Gramática del Castellano antiguo por Pedro de Mugica. Primera parte: Fonética.—**Hoelscher, L.**, Pro-

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1892.

i IN FRENCH *lieu*=LATIN *locum*.

THE curious form of the Modern French representative of Latin *LOCUM* has at various times engaged the attention of Romance scholars, but since no common consensus of opinion seems to have been reached, I may be pardoned in opening the question anew, while I endeavor to contribute my mite towards a solution of the problem.

The history of the three words *LÖCUM*, *FÖCUM*, *JÖCUM* (to which may be added *PAUCUM*, **BAUCUM*, *TRAUGUM*) before their appearance in literature is not without its knotty problems, which have received the most satisfactory explanation by Neumann in *Z. f. R. Ph.* viii, p. 386 et seq. The oldest forms of our words were *ſgu*, **lgu*, **jgu*, of which only *ſgu* is found in EUL. 19; but the forms *lgu* and *jgu* are thus established beyond doubt. The oldest occurrence of *LOCUM* is in the form of *leu* or *liu* in the ALEXIS, where *leu* has probably arisen from older *lgu* through the usual diphthongization of *g* to *uo*<*ue*; *lgu*>*luou* *luou*>*luēu*>*leu*; cp. Ascoli, *Riv. d. fil. class.* x, p. 28. Although none of the steps intermediate between *gu* and *eu* occur, there is no reason to suppose that the diphthongization to *uou* did not occur. It seems to me that its existence is placed beyond doubt by the occurrence of *loeus* in a dated document of the year 1289 given by Görlich, 'Nordwestliche Dialekte,' p. 48.

To establish a definite basis for our inquiry, it will be necessary to gather the earliest occurrences of these words in chronological order.

OLDEST MONUMENTS: EUL. *ſou*, 19; PASS. *loc*, *ſugs*, *ſoc* cannot enter into the argument, since they are Provençal forms.

ALEXIS: *leu* in MS. L. 27-c; MS. A. 27-c; *liu* MS. L. 114-e; *lieu(s)* MS. P. 27-c, 114-e.

PÈLERINAGE DE CHARLEMAGNE; *miliu* 349, (*liue*=LEUCA 264, 609).

LEGES WILLELMI CONQUESTORIS: *liu* p. 330, § 1.

1 Ed. Schmidt, 'Gesetze der Angelsachsen,' pp. 322-350.

ROLAND: *lius* 3016; *ſous* 3106, 3535; *giu* 977; (*liues* 688, 1756).

REIMPREDIGT, 'Grant mal fist Adam': *lius* 12-c (the MS. has *lieus*) **ſus* 6-d (a constructed form), *ſu* 17-c, *ſeus* 66-d.

OXFORD PSALTER: *liu* 22-1, 23-3, 25-31, 30-10, etc.; *milliu* 21-5 etc.; *ſou(s)* 10-7, 11-39; *ſu* 11-7, 16-4, 17-10, 15. Cp. Harseim, *Rom. Stud.* iv, p. 292.

CAMBRIDGE PSALTER: *liu(s)* 23-3, etc. (7 examples); *leu* 21-10, etc. (6 examples); *miliu* 35-1, (the general form) but *mileu* 137-7, 147-2; *ſous* 10-7, 11-6; *ſeu* only in MS. C. 20-9, MS. P. has *ſues*; cp. Schumann, *Fr. Stud.* iv, p. 322.

COMPUTUS: *liu* 2673; cp. Fenge, 'Sprachliche Untersuchung der Reime des Computus,' Stengel, 'Ausg. u. Abh.' iv, p. 54.

BRANDAN: *liu* 91, 431, (7 examples); the common orthography is *leu(s)*. *Lu* occurs 3 times; *leiu*, once; *ſu* 9 times, *ſou* 3 times in MS. L.; MSS. A. and Y have *ſeu*, P. has *ſu* and once *ſous*; cp. Hammer, 'Die Sprache der anglonormannischen Brandanlegende,' Halle, 1885, p. 23.

PARAPHRASE OF THE SONG OF SONGS: *leuz* 32.

ENEAS: *leus* 17, 458, 3554, 4461, etc.; *geu* 2159, 4863, 5471, etc.; *ſeu* 10, 289; cp. edition by de Grave, 'Bibl. Norm.' iv.

MARIE DE FRANCE: *liu* M. ii Eq. 158, L. 164, M. 192, 288; *ſeu* M. G. 348, 391, F. 204; *ſu* G. 241, F. 198; cp. edition by Warnke.

LIVRE DES MANIÈRES: *leu* 52-b, 329-d; *ſeu* 277-d, 323-c; *ſou* 193-d; *jieu* 277-a; cp. *eu* (= *öVUM*) 277-b; cp. Kremer, 'Estienne von Fougères, Livre des Manières, Rimarium, Grammatik,' etc.—Stengel, 'Ausg. u. Abl.' xxxix.

QUATRE LIVRES DES ROIS: *liu* 14-4, 17-13, 92-2, etc. (18 examples); *lieu(s)* 82-8, 93-2, 138-12, etc. (29 examples); *millieu* 255-17; *ſu(s)* 317-7, 321-9, 396-9, (17 examples); *ſeu* 269-11, 360-5, 367-19, (11 examples); *ſu* 4-13; cp. Schlösser, 'Die Lautverhältnisse der Quatre Livres des Rois,' Leipzig, 1887.

Before proceeding to my own explanation, it is in order to give a list of those explanations that have come to my notice. Diez, 'Gram.' p. 347 asks:

"Sollte der übliche altfranzösische Wechsel zwischen den Combinationen *eu* und *ieu* (*deu*, *dieu*, *Mattheu*, *Matthieu*) dazu verleitet haben?"

A different explanation was suggested by Förster, 'Chev. 2 esp.', p. xli, where he attributed the *i* in *lieu* to the influence of the initial *l*, as though *l* had become *ĭ*. Tobler in his edition of the 'Dis dou vrai Aniel,' p. xxvi, seems to accept the explanation of Diez, when he says:

"*Liex* (= *lieus*), mit seinem aus Diphthongierung des *e* zu erklärenden *ie*."

Meyer-Lübke in *Z. f. R. Ph.* xi, p. 541, gave an explanation which he repeated in his 'Rom. Gram.,' i, p. 180, and which is accepted by Neumann in *Z. f. R. Ph.* xiv, p. 555. In his opinion *lou* became *luen* > *liuen* > *lieu*. Cloetta's view, in the introduction to his edition of the 'Poème Moral,' *Rom. Forsch.* iii, pp. 68 ff., calls for mention more as a *curiosum* than for its scientific value; it is an illustration of the way in which Old French sounds certainly did not develop. Such heavy and almost unpronounceable combinations as **luoin* > *luŋiu* > *loiu* > *lou* or *luoin* > *lueiu* > *liiu* > *lyu* *lou* or *liiu* > *luu* > *liu* > *lieu* are fundamentally opposed to the trend of O. Fr. sounds. Finally Förster in *Z. f. R. Ph.* xiii, p. 545 reproduces independently of Diez and Förster their former explanation:

"Nach *leu*, *jeu* tritt endlich schon in ältester Zeit eine dritte Form *lieu*, *gieu*, *Mon-gieu*, auf, der man auch das bereits citirte *lieue* zuweisen kann und deren Erklärung wohl nunmehr keiner Schwierigkeit mehr unterliegt. Wenn man auch bei den mit *g* anlautenden Wörtern diesem die Entwicklung des *i* zuschreiben könnte, so ist doch einleuchtend, dass es der anderswo wohl bekannte Wechsel von *-eu* und *-ieu* ist, der unsere Wörter beeinflusst hat. Einerseits steht *DĒUM* neben *dē* mit *deu* und *dieu*, ebenso *Mahēu*: *Mahieu* (MATTHAEUM), *Andreu*: *Andrieu* (*ANDREUM), *Bertelmeu*: *Bertelmieu* (BARTHOLOMAEUM), *jueu*: *juieu*, *jieu* (JUDAEUM), *ebreu*: *ebrieu* u. a., pikardisch ebenso *diu*, *Mahiu*, *Andriu*, *Bretemiu*, *jiu* . . . Nur *jeu* hat sich der Wandlung in *jeu* ferngehalten, wohl um nicht mit *fieu*, pik. *fiu*, heutigem *fief* zusammenzufallen."

Now it seems to me that neither Meyer-Lübke's nor the Diez-Tobler-Förster explanation, is free from difficulties. Our knowledge of the dialect which was spoken in Ile de France, and which later contributed the largest

contingent to the present literary speech, is problematical before the thirteenth century. It is arrived at by a system of abstraction of those tendencies which appear to be common to all O. Fr. dialects. But it must not be lost from sight that the same results may be reached by different courses of phonetic development, so that it will often be absolutely impossible to assert with certainty that the Ile de France dialect followed a given line of development in preference to some other. While the diphthong *ue*, coming from Latin *ū* in certain parts of the Romance speech-territory certainly seems to have been *üe*, and while a change from *üe* to *ieu* is physiologically simple and possible, it does not necessarily follow that such was its sound and history everywhere. At the same time, I can not withhold the confession that an understanding of the original change of *ū* to *üe* is for me combined with the greatest difficulty. The original diphthong, which developed from Latin *ū* certainly began its career with *u*, and by anticipating the highest possible tongue position for *u* and exaggerating, at the same time, the rounding of the lips, till the sound produced is nearly a bilabial fricative, I can still obtain merely a very close *ū*. When the accent had changed from *ue* to *uē*, *u* was *u* and its change to vocalic *i* is out of the question. But it would seem to me that *yeux*=OCULOS, *vient* (=VOLET) and the whole class of words cited by Meyer-Lübke l. c. to substantiate his theory admit of a much simpler explanation, which I have already given in the *Publications of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION*, v, p. 101, and for which I bespeak here a second hearing. OCULOS became *uols* > *uēls* > *uēls* > *uēls* just as VOLET > *vuēlt* > *vuēlt* > *vuēlt* > *uēlt*; cp. 'Auc. Nic.' ex 14-12, *vent* 4-6, and in these last-named forms *u* diphthongised in good Picard manner, so that the words become *iex*, *ieus*, *vient*, very common forms in Picard texts; cp. *ieus* 'Car.' 58-12, 'Aniel' 48. In the case of *nuit* > *noctem* on the other hand the change of *u* > *ü* may have taken place after *uei* had been reduced to *ui*, by anticipating the *i* position for the tongue, while pronouncing *u*. Such a view of the question would practically mean an acceptance of the Diez-Tobler-Förster explanation, if it is applied to the history of LÖCUM, viz. *lou* > *leu* > *lieu*. An examina-

tion of the texts, however, shows that such can not have been the history. In the case of OCULOS and VOLET we find *ex*, *iex vent*, *vient*, in texts which are nearly contemporaneous, and where the *ɛ* underwent that secondary diphthongization which was so favorite a mode of procedure in that region. In my opinion *yeux* may be looked upon as a Picard form, unless it is to be presumed that the Ile de France dialect favored a similar line of development. In the same texts, however, those words which in Förster's opinion have influenced the diphthongization of *leu* to *lieu* show quite different forms. DEUM here appears as *diu(s)*; cp. 'Car.', 94-12, 185-1, 'Auc. Nic.', 2-22, and this *diu* represents the well-known reduction of an earlier *ieu* to *iu*; cp. Suchier, 'Auc. Nic³,' pp. 67, 68. The form *liu*, which occurs in the same texts might, therefore, well be a reduction of earlier *lieu*. Since, however, other Picard texts, on the other hand, show the opposite change of *iu* to *ieu*, cp. Suchier, *ibid.*, Neumann, 'Laut-und Flexionslehre,' p. 41, Raynaud, 'Dial. Picard,' p. 64, van Hamel, 'Rom. de Car. et Mis.,' p. cxxi, an earlier *liu* may also be believed to have given rise to *lieu*. It may be possible, if *lieu* is a strictly Ile de France form, that the latter dialect favored one of the two lines of development just mentioned.

But the problem before us is an explanation of the form at its earliest occurrence, and that is in the Norman dialect. If we here examine that class of words with Latin *ɛ*, of which DEUM may serve as type, and which are to have given the model for a similar change in *leu*, it appears at once that such a position is untenable. In the 'Oldest Monuments,' DEUM appears only as *deu*, so also in 'Alexis,' 'Charl.' 'Leges Willelmi Conquestoris,' and 'Rol.' The 'Reimpr.' has *deu*, *Ebreus*, *Judeu(s)* *Greu*, 'O. Ps.' *deu*, 'C. Ps.' *deu*, 'Comp.' *deu*, *Judeu(s)*, *Griu(s)*, *Mathiu*, 'Brand.' *deu*, *Albeu*, but *Juden(s)* in MS. A and Y, v. 1293 in rhyme with *pūs*, 'Eneas' *deu*, 'Marie de France' *deu*, 'Livre des Manières' *deu* (the inflected form is often written *dex* as in 189-b), 'Q. L. D. R.,' *deu*, *Judeu*, *Jueus*, but *ciens* (CAECOS), NEBULA > *nieule*. *Ciens* here can hardly be adduced to show diphthongization of *ɛ* before *u*, for *i* may be the parasitic vowel

coming from the palatal, (cp. the same explanation for 'O. Ps.' *cius*, Harseim, *Rom. Stud.* iv, p. 282) and *nieule* comes from NEB'LA, where the diphthongization of *ɛ* may be older than the vocalization of *b* > *u*. Moreover, the whole form of the word in this text with its vocalized *b* gives it the appearance of a borrowed word. It seems to me the testimony is conclusive; nowhere do we find diphthongization of *ɛ*, and if we are to accept a change of *ɛ* to *ie* in *leu*, the argument must be reversed, and it would have to be proved that *leu* > *lieu* rather became the model upon which *deu* changed to *diu*. If a change of *leu* to *lieu*, and similarly *deu* > *diu* is to be accepted for our texts, it follows further that Norman *liu* and similarly *Griu*, *Mathiu*, *Judius*: *pūs* in the 'Comp.' and 'Brand.' show a similar reduction of *ieu* to *iu* as the Picard dialect, which was mentioned above, and this is the position taken by Görlich, 'Nordwestliche Dialekte,' p. 48, and Meyer-Lübke, l. c., p. 180. But such a mode of reasoning is equivalent to a begging of the question, for from the 'Alexis' to the 'Q. L. D. R.,' Norman texts form a closely consecutive line and do not allow us to suppose that the diphthong *ieu* existed in the language without leaving any trace in literature. G. Paris seems to hold an opinion similar to that of Meyer-Lübke, since in the last edition of the text of the 'Alexis,' Paris, 1885, he writes *lieus*, whenever this word occurs, altogether against the authority of the older MSS. L, the oldest MS. has *leu*, A which is somewhat younger has *lieu* one time and once *leu*. *Lieu* is found only in MS. P., which G. Paris himself places at the end of the thirteenth century. Now MS. A of the 'Reimpredigt' is the same as MS. P. of 'Alexis' (Paris, Bibl. Nat. Franç., 19525) and both poems were copied by the same hand; cp. Suchier, 'Reimp.,' p. ix. It is not at all astonishing, therefore, that MS. A of the 'Reimpredigt' should show the same form *lieus*, where the other MSS. have *lius*. In both poems *lieu* must be considered as peculiar to the scribe, who saw *leu* or *liu*, but who was accustomed to pronounce *lieu*. The documentary evidence, it seems to me, is very consistent in demanding as the order of development *lou* > *leu* > *liu* > *lieu*.

But it is not at all absolutely necessary to

suppose that *iu* represents a reduction of *ieu*; *iu* may arise directly from *eu*. In Indo-germanic times, a similar change took place; for instance, in the second class of the strong verbs in the Germanic languages, and it is due to a partial qualitative assimilation of the two elements of the diphthong; both sounds take on an equal degree of narrowing in that part of the articulation which is peculiar to each. This process will account for *liu*, *Griu*, *Mathiu*, *Judius* et seq. In *deu* this change did not take place, because of the shortened form *de*, which is of very frequent occurrence.

In *giu* we may have at the same time influence of the preceding palatal, while *feu* remained as such, to keep the word distinct from *fiu*=FEODUM.

Aside of this younger *liu*, *leu* lived on; we find it used six times in the 'C. Ps.,' *liu* seven times; it is further found in Etienne de Fougère's 'Livre des Manières,' in 'Brut,' and 'Mont Saint Michel.' Both of these forms are compounded with the French form of Latin MEDIUM, and give thus *mileu* and *miliu*. It is doubtless merely an accident that *miliu*, 'Charl.' 349, is the oldest form occurring of the compound. Both are found side by side in the 'C. Ps.,' though *miliu* is the most frequent. At about the same time we meet with the form *milliu* ('O. Ps.'), where evidently the *l* has become mouillated under the influence of the two palatal vowels which surround it. The next variant of the word, which presents itself is *milieu*, evidently also with *l̃*. Whether *milieu* was formed to correspond to *leu*, because *milliu* corresponded to *liu*, or whether the *l̃* developed spontaneously, it may be impossible to decide, but it would seem that the chronological order of the appearance of our forms corroborates my theory. *Milliu* belongs to the first third, *milieu* to the last third of the twelfth century. From *milieu* the *l̃* is carried over to the simplex, but, since initial *l̃* does not exist in French, the sound is at once reduced to its elements and the word is pronounced *ljeu* (where *eu*=*eu* or *ö*) and written *lieu*. Both words belong together, for both occur for the first time in the same text.

That medial *l̃* was *li* or *lj* to the French ear as late as the seventeenth century, is amply proved by the grammarians in Thurot, 'De la

Prononciation française' ii, pp. 292 ff. Indeed, were it not for the fact that the true nature of *l̃* was unknown, as it were, till recent times, one might almost be inclined to agree with Vietor, 'Elemente der Phonetik,' p. 125 that *l* mouillé in the beginning of the sixteenth century was *li* or *lj*, while at the end of that century it had become palatal *l* (that is, *l* in *i* position)+*i* or *j*. However that may have been, it would certainly be extravagant to ask of the scribes of the twelfth century a correcter analysis of the sound than Sievers gave in 1876 in the first edition of his 'Grundzüge der Phonetik,' where on p. 105 he described *l̃* as *lj* (auch *ly*, *lj*). If, therefore, *milieu* was heard as *miljeu*, it was a simple and natural step to pronounce *ljeu* or *lieu* for *leu*. From *lieu* was again formed *millieu*, which I find quoted by Godefroy s. v. *argiller*.

This explanation of the *i* in *lieu* receives some additional weight, if we compare the modern pronunciations of *milieu* and *lieu*. Lessaint, 'Traité complet de la prononciation française,' p. 205, says:

'Il est vrai que le peuple de Paris mouille, à tort, l' des mots *cordelier* *milieu* et prononce *mi-ieu*.'

Often, and when the consciousness of the composition of the word is prominently in the mind of the speaker, he will pronounce *miljeu*, which has always produced on my own ear the effect of a strictly palatal *l* followed by *ɛ*. Passy, 'Sons du Français,' p. 19, does not go quite so far, when he says:

'Après et avant les sons palataux, (*l*) est légèrement palatalisé, c'est à dire que le milieu de la langue se rapproche du palais, comme dans *milieu* (*milyæ*).'

Not only is the *l* in *lieu* always slightly palatalized, but when it follows in a stress group after a word ending in a vowel, the difference between it and *l̃* is scarcely perceptible from the acoustic effect; *il y a des lieux* is very similar to *il̃ya d̃ɛ liæ*.

If this explanation of the word should be accepted, the other words of the group could be developed naturally without doing any violence to their forms. *Jieu* was only dialectic, as well as *jiu liu*, and *feu* never became *fieu*, because no such reason existed for its formation as in the case of *lieu*. *Lieue* (LEUCA) either came under the influence of *lieu* (LOCUM)

or it owes the triphthong to the same cause which produced it in *dieu* and its group, namely, diphthongization of *ē*. *Fu, ju, lu* all have developed from *eu* or *iu* by means of progressive assimilation of the elements of the diphthong (*iu* or *eu* > *uu* > *u*). To *lu* corresponds the compound *milu*, and it is doubtful if the palatal quality of the *i* is not still contained in the *u*, for in the 'Reimp.' *Deu le omnipotent* 47-d *milu* rhymes with *tenu*; but this would depend upon the nature of the dialect, for some texts, such as 'Brandan,' do not seem to know the *ü* sound; cp. Hammer, l. c. p. 19. *Lue*, Godefroy, s. v., *jue* and *lui* Eggert, 'Entwicklung der Normannischen Mundart,' *Z. f. R. Ph.* xiii, p. 373 derive from *lūen*, as Eggert supposes *ibid.*; *gi* (JOCUM) *milli*, *ibid.*, show regressive assimilation.

Whether Guernsey *liu*, *ibid.*, may be adduced to show that influence of *milū*, for which this paper contends, must remain undecided, for this dialect appears to have a special predilection for *ī*; cp. Eggert, l. c. p. 391.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

DIE KIRCHLICHE SATIRE UND RELIGIÖSE WELTANSCHAUUNG

in Brant's 'Narrenschiff' und Erasmus' 'Narrenlob,' resp. in den 'Colloquia.'

(SCHLUSS.)

So wenig Erasmus den Gedanken einer förmlichen Heerschau über die Schwächen und Laster aller Stände und Menschen oder die komische Wirkung seiner Kritik selbst zu erfinden brauchte, vielmehr gerade diese Züge—freilich mit erasmischem Geiste verfeinert—aus Brant schöpfen konnte, so ganz gehört ihm die Selbstständigkeit der reformatorischen Befehdung des in der Kirche vor sich gegangenen Verfalles. Seine Fülle von Scharfsinn, Wissen, kritischem Talent lief doch in letzter Instanz auf eine Renaissance des Christentums aus; der Ruhm der wissenschaftlichen That, der Ruhm, das erlösende Wort zuerst gesprochen zu haben, gebührt ihm. Und wenn die kirchlichen Reformen innerhalb der katholischen Kirche möglich gewesen wären, eine Annahme, die freilich D. F. Strauss als 'kind-

isch' bezeichnet hat, wenn der Grundsatz des edlen deutschen Cardinals Nicolaus Cusanus ausführbar gewesen wäre, dass nämlich

"man reinigen und erneuern, nicht zerstören und niedertreten, dass nicht der Mensch das Heilige umgestalten müsse, sondern das Heilige den Menschen," dann hiesse heut die lutherische Kirche die 'erasmische katholische.'

"Als angehender Dreissiger während seines ersten Besuches in England empfing er jene Anregungen, unter deren dauernder Nachwirkung der Gedanke in ihm erwachsen ist, *ein Reformator der Kirche zu werden*" (Fr. v. Bezold, 'Gesch. d. deutschen Ref.,' p. 230). Und den revolutionären Geist hat er denn auch unendlich gefördert, einen Geist, der allerdings in einem ihm später missliebigen Sinne alle Seelen durchdrang, "die er rief, die Geister, wurd'er nun nicht los." Und hierin liegt meines Erachtens der diametrale Gegensatz des Erasmus zu Brant.

Ein eifriger, ja oft genug starrer Vorkämpfer des katholischen Dogmas in allen Gestalten nicht aus Ursachen der Klugheit, sondern aus herzyniger Überzeugung steht er dem katholischen Rationalisten Erasmus schroff gegenüber, der sogar die Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit zu den offenen Fragen zählte, die Erbsünde, die Gegenwart Christi im Abendmahl, das Recht der Heiligenverehrung, das Wesen der Höllenstrafen stark bezweifelte. Mag sich der Humanist, noch so sehr dagegen verwahren, der Eindruck, den Luther aus seinen Schriften gewonnen:

"Erasmus ist ein echter Momus, der alles verspottet, auch die ganze Religion und Christum,"

drängt sich noch jetzt bei eingehender Prüfung seiner Schriften auf. Es widerstrebt mir, die vielen Stellen anzuführen, die darthun, dass ihm nichts geheiligt genug erscheint, dass er es nicht einem geistreichen, pikanten Einfall opferte; die reiche Zusammenstellung von Aussprüchen bei Stichart ('Er. v. Rot. Seine Stellung zu der Kirche und den kirchlichen Bewegungen seiner Zeit.' Leipzig, 1870, pp. 92-119,) geben Material genug an die Hand. Wie lästig ihm die Formen der Kirche erschienen, erweist eine Stelle, wie die folgende aus der 'Ichthyophagia':

"Nunc praeter tot vestium praescripta et interdictas formas et colores accessit capitis rasura eaque varia, ne commemorem interim

confessionis onus (cf. Stichart, p. 198 ff.) aliaque permulta, quae faciunt, ut hac parte non paullo commodior videatur fuisse Judaeorum quam nostra conditio."

Welch ein Contrast zu Brant's ganz in dem althergebrachten Katholicismus sich bewegenden Denkungsart, besonders in der Frage der Beichte und Absolution:

"der ablass ist so ganz unwärt,
das nieman darnoch frogt noch gärt;
nieman wil me den abloss sūchen,
jo mancher wolt in im nit flūchen,
mancher gūb nit ein pfenning uss,
so im der abloss kumt zu huss
und wūrt im darzu kumen doch,
er reicht in' verrer dan zu Och (d. i. Achen,
fernem Wallfahrtsort).
... als dūt man mit dem abloss ouch,
der wūrt veracht durch manchen gouch."

Kurz: Brant spricht schlieslich seine Überzeugung dahin aus:

... 'Weil man das Gnadenslicht verachtet,
wird man bald gūnzlich sein umnachtet,
das Schiff den Kiel nach oben kehrt.'
(Cap. ciii).

Und dass er es ehrlich mit seinen Überzeugungen meinte, das glaubt er selbst hervorheben zu sollen:

"... ich bin gar oft gerennet an,
wil ich diss schiff gezimert han,
ich soll es doch ein wenig fārben
und nit mit eichenrinden gārben.
... aber ich liess sie all erfrieren,
das ich anders dan worheit seit.
worheit die blibt in ewikeit,"

(Cap. civ).

Im cap. cv. ('Hindernisdes guten,') liegt durchaus der Sinn zu Grunde, dass Brant das Mönchsleben nach den Carthäuserregeln und der strengen Observanz für das allerrühmlichste hält im Gegensatz zu dem Leben der Narren,

"die in der welt hant als ir teil,
des sūchen sie nit selen heil,"

Auch die Ansichten über die Fastengebote, den Aschermittwoch und andere Formen der Demütigung vor Gott enthüllen die verschiedene Denkungsart beider Männer. Brant ist ein eifriger Anwalt der Fasten, Erasmus greift sie an und satirisiert sie, wo er nur kann:

"Cum ieiunio mihi nihil est negotii. Sic enim me docuit Hieronymus non esse valetudinem atterendam ieiuniis . . ." ('Pietas Puerilis') und mit besonderer Ironie in der 'Ichthyophagia.' Später hat Rabelais des Erasmus' Ansichten darüber völlig zu seinen eigenen

gemacht ('Oeuvres' iv, 32.), wo er im 'Quaresmeprenant' ein treffliches Bild der törichtten Faste entwirft,

"Père et nourrisson des médecins, faisonnant en pardons, indulgences et stations; bon catholique de grande devotion."

Aber Brant, der grosse Vorläufer der beiden Wahlverwandten,¹ beklagt die Nichtbeachtung der Fastengebote im cap. cx^b (bei Goedeke):

"... brechen das houbt der vasten ab
domit sie minder kreften hab.
wenig sich zū der āschen nahen,
das sie mit andacht die entpfahen,
fürchten, die āsch die werd sie bissen,
lieber went sie ir antlit bschissen
und sich berūmen wie ein kol;
des tūfels zeichen gēlt in wol,
das zeichen gots went sie nit han,
mit Christo went sie nit erstan."

Während ferner Erasmus, wo er sich auf Erörterungen über strittige Punkte einliess, stets als Rationalist von reinstem Wasser auftrat, der von seiner Abneigung gegen alles Dogmatisiren so wenig ein Hehl machte, dass er sogar erklärte, er möchte ohne die Autorität der Schrift und der kirchlichen Decrete (die erst Rabelais schonungslos angriff: 'Oeuvres' iv, 43) sich am liebsten stets auf die Seite der Skeptiker schlagen, ist dagegen Brant ein bis zur Orthodoxie treuer Anhänger des katholischen Dogmas. Mit Recht konnte daher J. Janssen ('Gesch. des deutschen Volkes,' i, p. 109), von seinem streng katholischen Standpunkte aus das 'Narrenschiff' eines der ehrwürdigsten Denkmale katholisch frommer Gesinnung, Brant selbst

"begeistert für die altchristliche Weltordnung im Pabsttum und Kaisertum und in seinem Glauben unwandelbar treu" nennen.² Ein untrüglicher Beweis für seine unerschütterliche Anhänglichkeit an den alten Glauben ist sein Grundsatz:

'Nit lass vom Glauben dich abflūren,
ob man davon will disputiren,
sondern glaub schlecht einfeltiglich,
wie die heilige Kirch thut leren dich.
Nimm dich der scharpfen Lehr nit an,
die dein Vernunft nit mag verstahn.'

(Zarncke, 'N. Sch.' im Anhang, 154).

¹ Dass Brants 'Narrenschiff' Rabelais bekannt gewesen, behauptet Louis Spach, *Bulletin de la Société littéraire de Strasbourg*, 1862, i, p. 38.—Vgl. auch: Th. Slippie, 'Gesch. des deutschen Cultureinflusses auf Frankreich,' i, p. 31 ff.

² Die treffende Vergleichung Brant's mit Erasmus, wie sie Janssen nennt, bei Stintzing ('Populäre Literatur,' p. 453), ist mir nicht zugänglich geworden.

Ein charakteristisches Streiflicht auf seine religiöse Neigung wirft seine unermüdliche Thätigkeit, in lateinischen und deutschen Gedichten für den strittigen Glaubensartikel einzutreten, dass die Mutter des Erlösers ohne Erbsünde empfangen worden sei (cf. Goedeke, 'Narrenschiff,' Einleitung, p. 8 und 9). Wie Erasmus über solche päpstliche Heiligsprechung dachte, ist z. B. in der 'Apotheosis Reuchlini' belegt und im 'Encomium':

"... praecipue deipara virgo, cui vulgus hominum plus prope tribuit, quam filio."

So zeigt sich der Gegensatz auf Schritt und Tritt zwischen dem tief religiösen katholischen Dichter, der "in seinem Narrenbuche jene Weisheit lehrt, die der Seele das ewige Leben erwirbt" (Janssen, i, p. 261), so dass ihn Geiler von Kaisersberg wohl von seinem Standpunkt "den Spiegel des Heils" nennen konnte, und zwischen Erasmus, der gelegentlich die stupende Äusserung—wenn auch nur im 'Lob der Narrheit'—wagt

"die ganze christliche Religion zeige eine gewisse Verwandtschaft mit der Torheit und stehe zu der Weisheit in keiner Beziehung."

Am meisten zu verwundern ist bei Erasmus, wie später bei seinem Bewunderer und Schüler Rabelais, nur, dass er den vielen Ketzeranklagen nicht zum Opfer fiel. Und gewiss fehlte es nicht an gutem Willen; wie die Sorbonneprofessoren später den Rabelais auf den Scheiterhaufen bringen wollten wegen der angeblich beabsichtigten Gotteslästerung 'âne' statt âme' ('Oeuvres,' iii, cap. 22. Anmerk. 11, bei Rathéry,) so erging es auch dem Erasmus wegen einer Stelle im 'Merdardus,' wo er anstatt "quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae"—"quia respexit vilitatem ancillae suae" gesagt haben soll. Aber wie Rabelais sein Spiel mit Buchstaben als einen Druckfehler hinstellte, so auch Erasmus: "Ea vox Syco-phantaë fuit, non Erasmi." Aber mag sich Erasmus noch so sehr als gläubigen Katholiken aufspielen, wo es Not that ('Coronis Apologetica'), und seine satirisch-pikanten Ausfälle als erfunden hinstellen

"Excussum est nuper Lutetiae, correctis, hoc est depravatis aliquot locis quae videbantur attingere monachos, vota, peregrinationes, indulgentias, aliaque huius generis, quae si plurimum valerent apud populum, uberior esset istis quaestus . . ."

wo er also selbst eine Ährenlese seiner Angriffe

gegen kirchliche Institutionen giebt, die am meisten Anstoss erregt hätten, mochten die Ausfälle in noch so eleganter Form vorgebracht werden,—die feindseligen Angriffe gegen Alles, was der Kirche sonst heilig war, bleiben doch bestehen. Hat er ja doch selbst die Anstössigkeiten im 'Encomium,' wie sie Bezold auf Seite 232 anführt, und sogar die Veröffentlichung des Satirenwerkes später lebhaft bedauert. Als er den Sturm entfesselt hatte, da wollte er freilich, dass er vieles gar nicht, vieles aber anders geschrieben hätte. Er hatte sich eine von ihm selbst geleitete humanistische Reform der Kirche gedacht, die nur die Gelehrten erst in den Kreis ihrer Betrachtung ziehen und nur allmählich in die Massen durchsickern sollte, indem sie ihnen die Medizin nur löffellweise verabreichte, aber alles, was ihnen nicht zu wissen gut war, selbst mit bewusster Täuschung verschwieg. Dieser halben und Compromisspolitik machte dann freilich Luther, der ein gewaltigerer Kämpfer war, ein jähes Ende, indem er auf dem von Erasmus geschaffenen Grunde Posto fasste, nachdem er den nunmehr nicht nur nutzlosen, sondern geradezu schädlichen, mit den Päbsten 3 unterhandelnden Erasmus vom Piedestal herabgeworfen.

Ist somit Erasmus' reformatorische Thätigkeit, in deren Vollendung ihn freilich der persönlich stärkere Luther abgelöst hat, aus jeder Zeile seiner Schriften ersichtlich, so ist es ebenso leicht, aus dem 'Narrenschiff' zu erweisen, dass der Gedanke einer Reformation in unserem Sinne in Brant auch nicht einmal aufgedämmert ist. Denn die im ersten Teil dieses Aufsatzes besprochene Brant'sche Satire versucht ja nur eine rein äusserliche Reform der äusseren Schäden, Verkehrtheiten und Laster, wo und wie sie sich immer zeigen; der dogmatische Bau des Kirchengebäudes sollte auch nicht einmal angetastet werden; die uneingeschränkte Autorität der Kirche mit ihrem Oberhäupte auf Erden war ihm über jeden Zweifel erhaben; alle, selbst die äusserlichsten Lehren des Glaubens unbeanstandet anzunehmen, war ihm innige Herzenssache. Dabei hat er bei der klaren politischen Einsicht, der er im cap. ix ('Von abgang des glouben') so

³ Dr. Hartfelder, 'Desid. Erasmi v. Rot. und die Päbste seiner Zeit,' im *Hist. Taschenbuch* von W. Maurenbrecher, vi. Folge, 11. Jahrgang.

meisterhaft Ausdruck gegeben, die Zuckungen der vorreformatorischen Zeit, die kirchliche Unruhe, die Gefahr der Situation für Kirche und Staat besser verstanden oder wenigstens geahnt, als irgend einer seiner Zeitgenossen. Aber die Ziele der reformatorischen Regungen, die schon am Ende des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts sichtbaren bedenklichen Anzeichen eines "abnehmenden Glaubens und der Verwirrung der Geister über die Lehren der Kirche und ihren Cultus" (Janssen, i, p. 623,) hat Brant von Anfang an mit bewusster oder nur gefühlter Härte befehdet. Schon im Anfange der neunziger Jahre des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts hat Brant die Vorboten des Sturmes verstanden, aber seine Ziele falsch gedeutet: er hat den Kampf gegen die heilige Schrift gerichtet geglaubt, während doch gerade die Reformation zu dieser als der einzigen, unverfälschten Quelle hindrängte. Er mahnt, bei dem alten Glauben zu bleiben:

"... darumb ist der blind und ertoubt,
der nit hört wissheit und ir gloubt,
oder hört gern nu [neue] mår und sag.
ich vorcht, es kumen bald die tag,
das man me nuer mår werd in
dan uns gefal und sig zu sin."

(Cap. xi).

Das ist deutlich die Reformation prophezeit und zwar in einem autireformatorischen Sinne. Die grösste Fundgrube für den Beweis seiner Strenggläubigkeit (nebst seiner bereits im ersten Teil behandelten patriotischen Gesinnung) liefert das oft genannte cap. ix. Sein Hass richtet sich zunächst gegen die Ketzer⁴ und erst in zweiter Reihe gegen den überall siegreich vordringenden Islam:

'wir nemen (leider) gröblich war
des kristenglauben not und klag,
der mindert sich von tag zû tag:
zûm ersten hant die kätzer hert
den halb zerrissen und zerstört;
darnoch der schëntlich Machamet
in mer und mer verwüstet het
und den mit sim irrsal geschünt'

Das Capitel 'Vom endkrist' (cap. ciii,) allein würde, wenn auch Brant sonst Nichts geschrieben hätte, den Dichter als einen recht activen Polemiker und Gegner aller vorlutherischen Reformbestrebungen erweisen und Goedeke's Ansicht (Einl., p. xxiv) widerlegen,

⁴ Erasmus persifliert trefflich die Ansichten der Theologen über die Ketzer: "Einen Ketzer ermahne einmal und abermal, dann—aus dem Wege (devita!)." 'Encomium.'

Brant habe sich jedes Zeichens von Beifall oder Misfallen enthalten, als Luther den Kampf gegen die römische Hierarchie unternahm; er habe eben keinen Sinn für die Reformation gehabt. Gewiss nicht! Brants ganze Vergangenheit zeigt zur Genüge, mit welchen Gefühlen von Widerwillen er dem kommenden Wirrwarr, "als ob alle Welt untergehen solle," entgegenschah. Übrigens kann man ja von der Analogie seiner Gefühle gegen Huss und die im Anschluss an ihn in Deutschland auftretenden Männer, welche die Unfehlbarkeit des apostolischen Stuhles bestritten,⁵ gegen Johann v. Wesel, der die Lehre vom Ablass, von der Heiligenverehrung, vom Fegefeuer, den heiligen Sacramenten der Beichte, des Abendmahles und der letzten Ölung bekämpfte, und den Luther beinahe als seinen Lehrer anerkennt ("Johannes Wesalia hat zu Erfurt die hohe Schule mit seinen Büchern regiert, aus welchen ich daselbst bin Magister worden");) auch auf Brant's Meinung über Luther einen sicheren Schluss ziehen. Das Bild vom 'Endkrist,' das er fünfundzwanzig Jahre vor dessen Auftreten gezeichnet, ist gewiss nicht durch die vollendete Thatsache bei Brant verblasst. Dieses Bild zeigt nämlich das Glaubensschiff umgestürzt. Der Teufel sitzt auf dem aus dem Wasser regenden Rumpfe. Ein Mann scheint mit einer Axt den Schiffsrumpf völlig zertrümmern zu wollen. Einige Narren im Boote suchen noch anderes vom Glaubensschiff losreißen zu wollen,—das sind doch deutlich die vorlutherischen Reformatoren, welche die Autorität der Concilien, die ganze hierarchische Ordnung und wichtige Grundlehren der katholischen Kirche verwarfen. St. Peter rettet das mit den rechten Gläubigen (Katholiken) gefüllte 'St. Peters Schifflein' ans Gestade. Und die Reformsüchtigen sind ihm doch wohl auch

"die rechten knaben,
die bi dem narrenschiff umtraben,
wie sie sich, und sunst vil, betrogen,
die heilig gschrift krümmen und biegen; 6
die gent dem glauben erst ein büß
und netzen das bapiren schiff;—

⁵ Im Jahre, 1495 trat Brant für die Vollgewalt des Papstes ein (Schmidt, *Revue d'Alsace*. Notice 198-200).

⁶ Vgl. dagegen Erasmus' Äusserung, dass die Bibel—auf die er sonst als ausschliessliche Quelle für die Theologie zwar verweist,—buchstäblich genommen ihrem Inhalt nach nicht selten lächerlich oder absurd, eher unter als über dem Niveau des antiken Mythos stehe (vide: Bezold, p. 232).

ein ieder etwas risst darab,
das es dest minder bort me hab,
rüder und riemen nimt darvon,
das es dest e [eher] mög undergon.
... das sint falscher propheten ler,
vor den sich hüten heisst der her; ... "

Wie verschieden ist doch diese Denkungsart von der des Erasmus, der bei seinem Ruf nach Reform die "falschen Propheten" gerade auf der andern Seite sucht;

"Un tas de papelards et faux prophètes, qui ont par constitutions humaines et inventions depravées envenimé tout le monde" ('Oeuvres,' ii, 29)

hat sie Rabelais später genannt.

Wo aber Brant einen Verfall im eignen Lager constatieren muss, da thut er es als treuer Anhänger des Pabsttums mit herzlichem Bedauern und immer mit einem feindlichen Seitenblick auf die bösen Angreifer:

"sant Peters schiffin ist im schwank,
ich sorg gar vast den undergank;
die wülen schlagen all sit dran,
es würt vil sturm und plagen han";

aber das geschieht nicht durch eigene, sondern durch die Schuld anderer:

"gar wenig worheit man ietz hört,
die heilig gschrift würt vast verkört
und ander vil ietz usgeleit,
dan sie der munt der worheit seit,
... falsch glouben und vil falscher ler
wachsen von tag zû tag je mer; ... "

und nun kommt wieder die klare Einsicht in die unbestimmte, gefährliche Zukunft, in der ein dämonischer Neuerer gegen das Besterende wüten wird:

"die zit die kumt! es kumt die zit!
ich vörcht der endkrist si nit wit!"

Wie total verschieden ist doch auch hier des Erasmus Meinung, der, wo auch immer er eine Gefahr für die Zukunft sieht, dieselbe in der Eigenart des zeitgenössischen Clerus findet, denn "sie wünschen (i. e. die Geistlichen) oder vielmehr ihr *γαστήρ*, dass im Christenvolke möglichst viel Aberglauben, aber möglichst wenig wahre Frömmigkeit sei."⁷ Die folgenden Zeilen, die sich als ein Glaubensbekenntnis Brant's darstellen, verraten am deutlichsten seine orthodoxe, katholische Gesinnung:

"uf dri ding unser gloub stat gar,
uf abloss, bücher und der ler,
der man ietz ganz keins achtet mer."

⁷ "... in populo Christiano superstitionis esse quam plurimum, pietatis quam minimum."

Was nun zuerst den Ablass betrifft, so habe ich bereits am Anfang dieses Artikels die entgegengesetzte Denkungsart beider Männer hervorgehoben. Was aus dem Ablass am Ende des fünfzehnten und am Anfange des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts geworden, ist ja aus Luthers Schriften satksam bekannt; auch Erasmus verabsäumt keine Gelegenheit, die Entartung und Demoralisation des Ablasses zu brandmarken. In 'Militis confessio' hofft der Soldat, der eben von sich eingeräumt: "Plus illic (i. e. in bello) scelerum et vidi et *patravi*, quam unquam antehoc in omni vita," und vorher: "sceleribus onustus redeo" dennoch auf völligen Ablass seiner Sünden bei den Dominicanern:

"Etiam si Christum ipsum spoliasset ac decolasset (!) etiam; largas habent indulgentias et auctoritatem componendi," etc.

Am heftigsten lässt er sich gegen den Ablass, wie er damals geworden, im 'Encomium' aus: "Was soll man von denjenigen sagen," bricht er los,

"qui magicis quibusdam notulis ac preculis, quas pius aliquis impostor, vel animi causa vel ad quaestum excogitavit, freti, nihil sibi non pollicentur, opes, honores, voluptates, saturitates valetudinem perpetuo prosperam, vitam longaevam . . . denique proximum Christi apud superos consessum . . . Hic mihi puta negotiator aliquis, aut miles, aut iudex, abiecto ex tot rapinis unico nummulo, universam vitae Lernam semel expurgatam putat, totque pericuria, tot libidines, tot ebrietates, tot rixas, tot caedes, tot imposturas, tot perfidias, tot prodiones existimat velut ex pacto redimi, et ita redimi, ut iam liceat ad novum scelerum orbem de integro reverti."

Ferner steht Brant's "gloub uf bücher," das heisst natürlich auf den Heiligen Schriften, und hier begegnet er sich scheinbar mit Erasmus, aber auch nur scheinbar, wie aus dem beschränkenden Zusatz hervorgeht:

"die vil der gschrift spürt man dobi,
wer merkt die vil der truckeri";⁸

Damit wendet er sich gegen die Bibelauslegung, und insofern steht er auf einem von Erasmus ganz verschiedenen Boden, der eben die Vernunft und das Denken in der Auslegung überall gelten lassen will.

⁸ Janssen, i, p. 622: "Einsichtsvolle Männer, wie Geiler von Kaisersberg und Sebastian Brant bestritten schon die Erspriesslichkeit der vollständigen Heiligen Schrift in den Händen des Volkes." ... "Alle Irrlehren seien durch falsche Auslegung der Schrift entstanden."

Zuletzt lässt Brant den Glauben auf der 'Lehre' beruhen; das kann bei ihm doch nur autoritatives, von der Kirche ein für allemal festgestelltes Dogma heissen. Denn gegen die Lehre des eignen Denkens und. Raisonniens hinsichtlich der Bibel verwahrt er sich ja ausdrücklich in demselben Abschnitt, Zeile 13-18:

"vil sint in irem sinn so klüg,
die dunkent sich sin witzig gnug,
das's uss eigner vernunft infall
die heilig gschrift usslegen all,
daran sie fülen doch gar oft
und wirt ir falsche ler gestroft";

Erasmus dagegen wendet sich mit Bitterkeit gegen den starren Glauben,⁹ die vom Scholasticismus überwucherte Lehre der Theologie seiner Zeit, die dogmatisch gehaltenen päpstlichen Decretalien, die als wesentliche Bestandteile der Kirche vorgeschriebenen Formen:

"Rursus audio videoque plurimos esse, qui in locis, vestibus, cibis, ieiuniis, gesticulationibus, cantibus summam pietatis constituunt, et ex his proximum iudicant, contra praeceptum evangelicum. Unde fit, ut, cum omnia referantur ad fidem et caritatem, harum rerum superstitione extinguatur utrumque" ('Encomium').

Diese wenigen Beispiele, die sich leicht ins Unendliche vermehren liessen, mögen genügen darzuthun, dass Brant und Erasmus in allen Stücken hinsichtlich der Prinzipien des Glaubens einer ganz verschiedenen Anschauung huldigten.

Es bleibt nur noch übrig, in Kürze zu erwähnen, dass der Begriff 'Humanist' im heutigen Sinne des Wortes, der dem Brant so allgemein gedankenlos beigelegt wird, demselben in keiner Weise etwa so zukommt, wie etwa einem Reuchlin, Hutten oder Erasmus. Goedeke's Äusserung (Einl., p. xi) ist äusserst treffend. Derselbe sagt:

"Für uns scheint allerdings Brant's eigentliche Wirksamkeit die humanistische zu sein; er beschränkt aber diese vorsichtig gehaltene Behauptung im Folgenden wesentlich. Es ist in der That nicht schwer, die Behauptung, er sei noch mehr ein Scholastiker gewesen, als ein Humanist, aus seinem Leben und seinen Schriften vielfach zu belegen, ohne dass dies

⁹ "Verum exstiterunt hoc saeculo quidam qui docent, hominem sola fide iustificari, nullo operum praesidio, etc." ('Exequiae Seraphicae').

aber dem edlen Character, dem ausserordentlichen Bildungswert des Mannes für seine Zeit irgend welchen Eintrag thun könnte. Dabei will ich nicht etwa seinen Mangel an griechischer Bildung hervorheben, die Goedeke (p. ix und x) auf "ein bischen Griechisch, etwa einige Vocabeln und die Buchstaben," reducirt. Aber er steht durchaus noch auf scholastischem Boden, wenn er sich gegen die Wiederbekanntmachung der alten Bücher wendet:

"all bücher sint ietz fürher bracht,
die unser eltern ie hant gmacht;
der sint so vil ietz an der zal,
das sie nüts gelten liberal,
und man ir schier nit achtet mer, . . ."

und vorher in demselben Abschnitt (cap. ciii, Zeile 77):

'darzû dünt drucker ietz güt stür;
wan man vil bücher würf ins für,
man brant vil unrecht, falsch darin.
vil trachten allein uf gewin,
von aller erd sie bücher süchen,
der correctur etlich weng rüchen.'

Aus all diesem geht hervor, dass manches wertvolle Buch uns nicht überkommen wäre, wenn es auf Brant's fromme Wünsche allein angekommen wäre, so wie er ja auch keinen rechten Sinn für die gar zu ausgedehnte Verallgemeinerung der Bildung durch die vielen neuen Schulen, welche die Bildungsbestrebungen der Renaissance hervorriefen, bekundete. Man kann sich des Verdächtens nicht erwehren, dass Brant immer noch die Monopolisirung der Bildung für gewisse Stände, besonders den geistlichen, in Anspruch nehmen wollte, wenn er nicht gerade lobend sagt:

"so vil der schülen man nie fand,
als man ietz hat in allem land,
es ist schier nienan stat uf erd,
do nit ein hohe schul ouch werd."

Freilich verrät auch wieder manche Stelle seines Werkes den Stolz, den er über deutschen Geist und deutsche Bildung empfindet, wenn er, z. B., gegen die Narren loszieht, die nach "welschen" Universitäten ziehen, sich dort ihre Bildung zu holen,

'als ob nit ouch in tlitscher art
noch wer vernunft, sinn, houbter zart,
domit man wisheit, künst möcht leren . . .
weller will leren in sim [deutschem] land,
der findt ietz bücher aller hand,
das nieman mag entschuldung sich,
er well dan liegen lästerlich.'

Aber im Grossen und Ganzen soll doch bei Brant die klassische Bildung, die immerhin stark mit der Scholastik verquickt ist und beständig die Versöhnung des Wissens mit dem Dogma der römischen Kirche zum Zweck hat, die Magd des Glaubens bleiben,—und insofern ist Brant noch ein Scholastiker im ursprünglichen Sinne des Wortes ohne jede üble Nebenbedeutung. Dem Erasmus hingegen ist jedes religiöse Interesse zugleich und besonders ein Bildungsinteresse, er will das Altertum auch als einen religiösen Bildungsstoff und als ein Lebelement der neueren Völker betrachtet wissen. Ist Erasmus der unendlich genialere, aufgeklärtere Mann, der Humanist *par excellence*, der religiöse Neuschöpfer, dessen Verdienst aber geschmälert wird, weil er die Neuschöpfung nicht zu Ende geführt hat, so müssen wir Sebastian Brant in seinem ganzen Lebensgange als den consequenteren, treueren, ehrlicheren Mann, "iustum et tenacem propositi virum," ansehen, dessen Gestalt in absoluter Reinheit in unsere Zeit hineinragt.

HERMANN SCHÖNFELD.

Johns Hopkins University.

INITIAL *kn* IN ENGLISH.

IN his treatment of initial *kn* in English ('Hist. Eng. Sounds,' §924) Henry Sweet throws doubt upon the accuracy of the statements made by German observers of English pronunciation in the past century, which were to the effect that initial *kn* was pronounced *tn* or *dn*. The other evidence as to the pronunciation of *kn* is that it was at one time sounded as *hn*, and Dr. Sweet says:

"This, of course, means that *kn* did not become the present (n) by mere dropping of the *k*, but that the *n* was unvoiced by the off breath-glide of the *k*, which was then itself dropt as superfluous.¹ [Voiceless *n*] was afterwards levelled under the more frequent [voiced *n*]. The same change of *kn* into [voiceless *n*] has taken place in Mn. Icel., where *knúf* is pronounced [nʰiv]. The *tn* of the Germans was, no doubt, only a clumsy way of indicating the voiceless *n*."

While *kn*- with mouth-explosive *k* might have passed through *kn*- with nasal explosive *k*, directly into *hn* with nasal *h*, and then on

¹ For what Sweet means by this, cf. 'H. E. S.,' § 107. What stands above in [] is the transliteration of the visible speech symbols used by Sweet.

down, as Dr. Sweet says, there is no reason why we should reject so direct and welcome contrary evidence as that furnished by the German grammarians, particularly when we find it corroborated by that of persons living in our own day.

I believe the development to have been as follows:

1. *kn*=mouth-explosive *k*,+*n*. This was the original Germanic *kn*- and is still considered the normal *kn*- in German. In England it changed to 2 (see below) in the early part of the seventeenth century, at the latest.

If the tongue, by anticipation, assumes the position for *n* before the explosion of *k* is made, this explosion must take place through the nose (Sievers, 'Phonetik', §22, 2; Sweet, 'P. of P.,' §78)² and we get:

2. *kn*=nasal explosive *k*,+*n*. This is a common pronunciation of *kn*- in middle and southern Germany; but an untrained observer would not detect its difference from *kn*- (1), and we need not be surprised that we have no record of its replacing *kn*- (1) in English.³

For the production of this *k* it is necessary that the back of the tongue be raised; but the front of the tongue is also raised for the production of the *n*, and must remain up longer than the back, inasmuch as the *n* continues after the *k*. If the back of the tongue be allowed to sink a little sooner, or before the explosion through the nose, this explosion is made with the mouth closed only by the front of the tongue, and is a *t*-nasal explosion, and we have:

3. *tn*=nasal-explosive *t*,+*n* (cf. the same in such words as *whiten*, *Whitney*,⁴ etc., as contrasted with the mouth-explosive *t* in *white*, *whit*, etc.). This pronunciation of *kn*- prevailed in England in the middle of the seventeenth century, and must have been quite common

² In *p*-, *t*-, *k*- nasal explosives, the explosion is, of course, made in the same place and in the same way; the quality of the sound (about as distinct as in the case of *m*, *n*, *ŋ*) is determined by the place where the mouth passage is closed.

³ Nasal explosive *k*,+syllabic *ŋ* may frequently be heard as a weak form of *can*, having perhaps started before the familiar words *go*, *come*, *get*, etc.

⁴ Initial nasal-explosive *t* may be heard in *ai dōn tnō*, which was probably the bridge between *ai dōnt nō* and *ai dō(n) nō*; all three still in use.

even in the beginning of the eighteenth century (1693 Nicolai: "Si verò *n* statim sequitur, ferè ut *t*, ut *know*, *knife*, *knee*"; similarly 1705 Tiessen, 1711 Beuthner, 1717 Ludwig; while 1706 König's 'Guide' and 1718 Arnold described it as a weak *d*⁶), but was in 1725 already regarded as antiquated by Lediard⁷ (cf. 4 below). In parts of England (Cumberland and Westmoreland) it, however, maintained itself till the middle of this century (cf. Ellis: 'Early Eng. Pronunciation,' v, pp. 542 bot. and 601, 2 in second col.), and is still reported here and there in the North ('E. E. P.' v, p. 633, 92⁸). In Germany this pronunciation of *kn-* is common, at least in Saxony, where it is a source of much annoyance to over-zealous school teachers.

If now the passage to the nose be opened a little sooner, or just as the front of the tongue rises to close the mouth, there will be no explosion into the nose, but only a puff of air before the vocal chords begin to vibrate for the production of *n*, and we have:

4. *hn*=nasal *h* (or voiceless *n*), + *n*. This pronunciation of *kn-* was already common in parts of England as early as 1685 (Cooper:

"*kn* sonatur ut *hn*; *knave* nebulo . . quasi *hnave*, etc.,"

cf. Ellis 'E. E. P.' ii, p. 544, N²). In 1725 Lediard (as translated by Ellis: 'E. E. P.', iv, p. 1046) writes:

"*k* before *n* at the beginning of a word is only aspirated, and spoken as an *h*; as *knack* knäck, *knife* hneif, etc. M. Ludwick⁷ says

5 Cf. Viator: 'Die Aussprache des Eng. nach den deutsch, englischen Grammatiken vor 1750,' Marburg 1886 (pp. 15, 16). In MOD. LANG. NOTES for March, 1888, (col. 130) H. Schmidt says:

"I am inclined to think that *kn* went through the stage of *tn* before being completely dropped," and in the April number (col. 192) he translates what Viator says, p. 171 of his 'Phonetik'.²

6 That some writers in describing a nasal-explosive *t*, spoke of it as a weak *d*, is not strange; for to-day, if persons unacquainted with phonetics be asked how the *t* in *Whitney* differs from that in *whit*, the more muffled sound often leads them to say it resembles a *d*.

7 As to the fact that Lediard (who, though he wrote in German, was an Englishman) represents a pronunciation that is not only chronologically younger than that of Ludwig, but also that of the less-cultivated classes and consequently less conservative, cf. Löwisch: 'Zur Eng. Aussprache von 1650-1750 nach früheng. Grammatiken' (Jena Thesis), Kassel-1889, p. 14.

8 The *k'n* reported from the South Lowland ('E. E. P.' v, p. 717, 92 and 234) may be for *tn*.

that *k* before *n* is called *t*; Arnold and others declare that it is pronounced *d*. But any one experienced in English pronunciation must own that only a pure gentle aspiration is observable, and by no means so hard and unpleasant a sound as must arise from prefixing *d* or *t* to *n*."

This *h* in time unvoiced the *n* and we get:

5. *hn*=voiceless *n* (just as O. E. *hw-*, M. E. *wh-*, quite generally became voiceless *w*). This pronunciation of *kn-* is the normal one in Modern Icelandic. In English it still exists in Westmoreland and Cumberland along the river Eden (Ellis, 'E. E. P.', v, pp. 539; 555; 566, last col. but one; 595, 2), parts of Yorkshire ('E. E. P.', v. p. 615, 3; 620, 92; 633, 92; etc.), and elsewhere.

This voiceless *n* occurring so much less often than voiced *n*, was, in time, levelled under the latter (just as the voiceless *w* (written *wh*) has, in southern England and some of our eastern states become *w*), and we have:

6. *n* alone, the normal Modern English pronunciation of *kn-*. The earliest statement that initial *k* before *n* is entirely silent is that in König's 'Grammar' (Viator, 'Die Aussprache des Eng.', p. 15), which may indicate an exceptionally advanced development in some localities, but is more likely an inaccurate account of 4 or 5 above.⁹

The change of *kn* to *n* has been a favorite example with those who would explain most phonetic changes as due to the indolence of speakers, so Skeat, 'P. E. E.', i, p. 358, says: "The difficulty of sounding *k* and *g* before *n* has led to their total suppression in Mod. E." Looking at the extremes, *kn* and *n*, this appears plausible enough; but an examination of the steps of the transition shows the wrongness of the view.

Of the five changes, 2, 3, and 4 are due to anticipation, whereby an operation is hastened or performed before its proper time,—itself of course a gradual process; 5 is the result of regressive assimilation, and 6 of levelling. Of these, 5 alone (the delay of the vocal vibration) could be construed as due to indolence; while the first three changes might with as much reason be explained as due to zeal and energy.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

9 Attempts that I have made to discover in this country any trace of initial *k* before *n*, have thus far proved fruitless.

A FEW NOTES ON OLD FRENCH PHONOLOGY.

THESE notes are suggested by and are put in the form of comments on the third edition of Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland.' It is unnecessary for me to say anything in praise of this book, and it is pretty certain that some, at least, of the matters I speak of in the following lines, have intentionally been left unmentioned by the author. It is precisely because the book already does so much for the beginner in helping him to realize what he is very apt not to realize, namely, that sounds are not the same thing as the letters used to represent them, that I bring forward these considerations. It seems to me they concern points where the bright student needs help with the questions he will be likely to ask. It should be added that I have in view the needs of American students particularly, and that I do not confine my remarks to the changes made in the third edition. P. xxxvi. The *j* at the end of the table of consonant signs used in the 'Observations grammaticales' has the dot; of course a misprint. P. 3. It is not quite clear to me why Paris does not include here *iu* as one of the diphthongs (§4); from the language used "Les autres groupes de voyelles contiguës forment toujours deux syllabes," it would be inferred that he considers the form *siut*=*sequit*, mentioned in §102, p. 44, as having two syllables, which I cannot believe. Pp. 6, 7, §§12, 17. One would like to see either less detail or more; as stated here the rules for *é* and *è* in unaccented syllables are apt to perplex and confuse rather than to help. Both are said to come "à l'atone" from "*è, ê, y* entravés," though these are not the only sources mentioned. From the analogy of §22 one would expect a different rule for the *e* (cf. however §10). The subject is too difficult for any but the clearest statements to be desirable. If a brief statement is to be made, would it not be well to say that the exact determination of *é* and *è* in unaccented syllables in the language of the 'Roland' is not possible? P. 11, §32. It is a pleasure to see the new signs for the *t* and *d* which later disappear and the account given of their values (§45), but if these two consonants are recognized for the period concerned, ought not one more consonant to

be added which French has since lost? Suchier has it in his table (Gröber's 'Grundriss,' p. 585, as well as *ʒ* and *ð*=Paris's dotted *t*, *d*); he marks it *ŋ*. It is the sound of *n* before a *g* or *k* sound, written *ng* in English *hang*, *sung*, and occurring in English in a number of words from Old French (*anguish*, *rank*, *uncle*), and according to the statements in §§53, 54 for *m* and *n* it would seem that Paris ought to recognize this value for the first *n* in *sanglent*; the same value which Latin *n* had in a similar position. I make no strong objection to the lack of any mention of palatalized consonants (the *d* of *aidier*, the *s* of *laissier*, etc.), for perhaps the author considered that such mention would embarrass the learner more than it would help him, or he may have had other good reasons for silence. English words like *finish*, *leash*, etc., might be brought forward in considerable numbers to show that the palatal *s* (*s'*) or some sound developed from it existed in Old French. Are the cases where English has an *s* sound for a theoretical Old French palatal *s*, to be explained sometimes as later borrowings when *s'* had become simply *s* in French, and has the spelling sometimes caused *s* to be the sound in English instead of *ʒ*? I incline to the opinion as the result of a still incomplete study, that, with due allowance for disturbing factors, the English forms will be found to corroborate the view that a palatal *s* existed in Old French. I know of no evidence for Behrens's and ten Brink's theoretical Old French *stʃ*, *sʃ* in the history of *angoisse* from *angustia* (see Franz. *Studien*, v, 189, ten Brink, "Chaucers Sprache und Verskunst," p. 75, and recently Behrens, in Paul's 'Grundriss der germ. Philologie' i, p. 835), and it seems to me improbable that it ever existed there. I think a palatal *s* can explain the *-iss-* in *angoisse*, and some cases at least of Italian *sci*(=*ʃ*). The combination *stʃ* we may assume as the early value of *sch* in O. Fr. *sche*=Lat. *sca*; for example (*pescheor*=*piscatorem*), but here it later becomes *ʃ*, not *iss*.—To return to Paris's 'Extraits,' it does seem to me that §91 might, with the assumption of palatalized consonants, be put in a way which would be easier for the student to understand and remember. P. 14, §43. The value of *qu* is an interesting question; if in the Old French brought over into Eng-

land the combinations *qui* and *que* always meant *ki*, *ke*, it would seem that our modern pronunciations in *quit*, *quest*, etc. (cf. *conquer* with *k* by the side of *conquest* with *kw*) are due to the influence of the spelling, even in words so popular as *quit*, *quits*, *quite*. There is no doubt of this in some cases (cf. *equip*). But in learned or semi-learned words may not the *qu* have been pronounced in O. Fr. with the traditional value of *qu*, that is, with consonantal *u* (or *ü*) when *e* or *i* followed? Cf. O. Fr. *qui* for *cui*, and the occasional spelling with *cw* in Middle English in some cases. In the last sentence of § 43, I should translate "sans doute" to students by some such word as "perhaps"; there is no phonetic difficulty about *kw* and *gw* before *e* and *i*. P. 18, § 48. A few remarks on the phonetic value of the *z* here spoken of (*otre-ier* from *auct'rizare*, not *auct'ricare* as before; see the glossary), and the way it becomes *y* (Paris's undotted *j*) would have been welcome, and would help the understanding of § 91. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, 'Gramm. der roman. Sprachen,' § 17, p. 34 (O. Fr. *batoyer*=*baptizare*, and the rest of the paragraph on Greek ζ), also Schuchardt in the *Literaturblatt* v, 62. Would not the assumed value *dz* for the Greek letter explain everything? This might have become either identical with *dy* or else confused with it, perhaps through an intermediate form *dž*. Whether the earlier Latin *ss* for Greek ζ had at first a phonetic value (*zz*?) depending on a popular imitation of *dz* I will not here discuss, though that does not seem to me at all impossible. Cf. also the remarks on *z* in Gröber's 'Grundriss,' pp. 448, 584-586. The value of the *z* in Old and Modern French comes up again in connection with § 56, p. 21. If we compare the *z*=*ts* after "*n* appuyée (*anz*)" mentioned in this paragraph, we shall perhaps think there is some reason for giving the *z* in *quinze* at least the value of *dz* rather than of "*s* douce," especially if we reflect that *z* in Old French meaning *ts* has that value when its position corresponds to that in which *d* (for example) becomes *t*; so that the traditional value *dz* would most naturally be assumed for it when the voiced pronunciation raises no difficulty. The sound *z* was in Old French usually represented by *s*, as Paris says in § 46. One can

hardly help thinking of the two values of *z* in Italian, and supposing that the French value is not unconnected historically with one or both of the Italian meanings of the sign (of which I assume *dz* as the proper traditional one, the use for *ts* being later and not unnatural). In that case, too, we can easily understand how *z* in later French (and hence in English) spelling has the value of voiced *s*; it has lost the *d* of the older value *dz*, just as O. Fr. *c* when =*ts* now means *s*, and as Old French *j* and *g* (before *e*, *i*) now means *ž*, instead of *dž* as formerly. Of course we do not need to assume that O. Fr. *z* meant *dz* in any cases in order to explain its modern value. I only mean that the modern value is not inconsistent with an earlier value *dz* in certain cases. If O. Fr. *z* had two values and one was *ts*, then the other seems to me more likely to have been *dz* than *z* in the eleventh century. P. 29, § 71. The masculine numeral 'two' is apparently omitted by mistake. P. 35, last line of § 87, the addition of words like "except those in *-jan*" would perhaps help the beginner. P. 36, § 91. It is not clear why *s*, *l*, *n*, when preceded by a palatal, are not mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph where the statement seems intended to be complete.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

HERMANN UND DOROTHEA.

Hermann und Dorothea von Goethe: Edited with Introduction and Notes by CALVIN THOMAS, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literature in the University of Michigan. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1891. xxii, 104.

Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea edited with an Introduction and Notes by W. T. HEWETT, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Cornell University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1891. 1, 233.

HERE we have two American editions of a work of Goethe, of which we had already one excellent edition by Professor J. M. Hart, published by the Putnams, and a cheap one published by the Holts. Many of us would have been content to wait for these new editions

until we had an edition of the complete Faust and Wallenstein, also of a more comprehensive and representative Schiller's Prose than that of Buchheim. Prof. Thomas's edition of 'Hermann und Dorothea' is intended to supersede the old-fashioned Krauss edition which Messrs. Holt & Co. have had on their list a great many years. This new one appears also in the cheap paper cover of the "Student's Collection of Classic Plays" (*sic*). Professor Thomas's excellent introduction and judicious notes deserved better treatment from the publishers. Every page has the absurdly superfluous heading "Hermann und Dorothea" and nothing more. In Professor Hewett's bibliography, Professor Thomas's edition is not mentioned, owing to the fact, no doubt, that their books appeared within a few months of each other. The two editors do not agree as to the quality of the German hexameter. Professor Thomas inclines to the view expressed in Platen's famous distich

Holpricht ist der Hexameter zwar, doch wird das Gedicht stets
Bleiben der Stolz Deutschlands, bleiben die Perle der Kunst.

Prof. Hewett thinks that the verse of the poem suggests nothing unnatural and foreign, and that even the hexameter of Longfellow's 'Evangeline' is a success. But many will be inclined to take Longfellow at his word when he says:

"The motions of the English Muse [in the hexameter] are not unlike those of a prisoner dancing to the music of his own chains." Professor Thomas's "few remarks upon the metre," as he modestly calls them, set the difficulties of modern hexameter in a very clear light before the students. I wonder that Prof. Hewett, whose edition is very elaborate and learned and who often quotes and speaks of Voss's translation of Homer, does not mention Matthew Arnold's essay "On Translating Homer" in his 'Essays in Criticism.' Arnold speaks of Voss, Evangeline, Goethe and the comparative fitness of German and English for hexameter.

I cannot agree with Professor Thomas that *fasse*, p. 62, l. 2, (vii, 2) is a preterite subjunctive in a hypothetical relative sentence. In my opinion it is a preterite indicative for a perfect. *Die treffende Rede*, in ix, 130, he trans-

lates: "the appropriateness of the words." Professor Hewett has the phrase in his index but not in the notes. Professor Hart translates "searching." Why not take *treffend* in the sense of 'to wound, hurt the feelings of,' which sense it has two lines above:

Da die Scherze des Vaters schon dich treffen so tief?

Professor Hewett's edition

"owes its origin to the wish of the publishers to include this favorite poem in their series of annotated texts."

Without question, it will rank with the best work done in the way of editing in America. This is saying a great deal, when we have Hart's 'Faust' i. and 'Goethe's Prose', Primer's 'Minna von Barnhelm,' White's 'Lessing's Prose' and Thomas's 'Tasso.'

Messrs. Heath & Co. had announced 'Hermann und Dorothea' in the "intermediate" group of texts. The elaborate introduction of fifty pages, the complete bibliography and the ample notes place it in the advanced group. The wisdom of this change may be questioned. Goethe's exquisite little epic is again weighed down, as it has been before at English and German hands, with learned and minute comments, with hardly pertinent quotations, with etymological material and too frequent translations. This gem of an idyl with its homely story, its lifelike characters so few in number, its Homeric simplicity, its vivid picture of German *Kleinstädtereie* upon the awful historic background of the last decade of the eighteenth century, is so easily put in the shade by the accumulated material of Düntzerian annotation. Professors Hart and Thomas are much more humane and appreciative than the other commentators. They emphasize, more even than Professor Hewett, the Homeric manner of the poem, though the latter has a list of Homerisms in his index. Says Professor Hart, p. xx, of his introduction:

"although the poem is throughout descriptive, it contains scarcely a description. The objects of the world of nature are not described by a tedious enumeration of their size, color, proportions, or the like, but by representing them as acted upon by man or as acting upon him."

Now this, in our opinion, strikes the keynote to a just estimate and full enjoyment of the poem. On this point see also Professor Thomas's Introduction, p. xviii.

Professor Hewett's Introduction treats of the sources of the poem, of the historical background, of the composition, of Voss's 'Luise,' of the text and of the verse. Under the first head the story of the Salzburg exiles is given in German and in English. It seems to me one would have been enough. Both *fein* and *redlich* are here rendered by 'honest.' The sections on the text and metre are excellent. The general index is valuable in spite of some omissions. Among the general reference books, Eberhard's 'Synonymisches Wörterbuch' is mentioned. It is a book to which our students ought to refer much oftener than they do. M. Heyne's 'Deutsches Wörterbuch' is out, at this writing, as far as *Licht* and will deserve a place in such a list.

The 'Elegie,' written by Goethe while composing 'Hermann und Dorothea,' was not prefixed to the poem proper until 1820. It has been included by Professor Hewett. It is somewhat difficult, but copious notes explain the allusions and its relation to the 'Xenien' and to 'Hermann und Dorothea.'

In the preparation of the Notes it has been the editor's purpose

"to lead from the study of the poem to a wider knowledge of the language of the author and of the period in which he lived, and to make this work serve as an introduction to a more critical study of Goethe's life and writings."

Among the several objects which we may have in view when studying a literary work, one seems to have been uppermost in the editor's mind; namely,

"to illustrate the thoughts of the author and the place which it bears in the history of his life."

Hence those long translations from Goethe's diary under the head of 'Composition of the poem,' and the frequent citations from 'Dichtung und Wahrheit' and 'Campagne in Frankreich.' Why some of these are given in English, some in the original is not apparent. The same extract is given in English, in the introduction p. xxx, and in German p. 119.

The excellence of the notes lies in the line of history, Goethe-Literature, folk-lore, proverbs and German life and customs. The editor has made the most of the occasions offered him to elucidate points on the last three subjects. A whole page is given to liberty trees, one to

Korb 'mitten,' half a page to the stork and to *Pfennig*. After *Karrn* and *Wagen* had escaped in i, 117, they get a long note in v, 185 with a reference to Hildebrand's article in Grimm's 'Dictionary' thrown in. In fact one gets the impression that many notes are overdone. After *Elend* had received half a page in i, 8, it is again taken up in v, 99. What may be called the indefinite *auch* is not in the index, but, perhaps therefore, it has been treated three times; namely, in ii, 232; iii, 26; iv, 182. After the superfluous *nicht* of exclamations had been overlooked in i, 4, it is treated at length in iv, 187, with a reference to Grimm and with the final remark, "This usage is so familiar in English as scarcely to attract attention." Why speak of it at all? The accusative absolute is treated four times, namely, iv, 24, 178; viii, 85; ix, 90; but only two are in the index. The words meaning to 'linger' are treated twice: ii, 195; vi, 298. After the difference between *Pferd*, *Ross* and *Gaul* has been stated in a note on ii, 61, the etymology of *Pferd* follows in ii, 135. The notes upon i, 190, 97; v, 82 contain, so to speak, a note upon or within a note. In the first example there is a note upon the *Weltkind*, occurring in the famous lines that were written on the Lahn-Rhine trip of 1774:

Prophete rechts, Prophete links,
Das Weltkind in der Mitten.

For the study of Goethe's life and language the frequent citations from his works are welcome, but a number of other quotations are not pertinent; for example, von Feuchtersleben's "Es ist bestimmt in Gottes Rat," etc., taken from Wagner's edition, ix, 180; two stanzas from Paul Gerhard's 'Ich bin ein Gast auf Erden,' ix, 269; Voss's 'Luise' ii, 12, on H. and D. vi, 147, where *häuslich* is used in a different sense by Voss, if Grimm's 'Dictionary' is right. The note on ii, 166 is as follows:

"Every beginning is difficult said the thief when he stole the anvil. 'Aller Anfang ist schwer sagte der Dieb und stahl zuerst einen Amboss.'" Simrock p. 18."

Now, is it worth while to quote the simple proverb expanded by this trifling folk-witticism?

As actually misleading must the following quotation be characterized, in the note on *zu*

in i, 200, which is interpreted as "in addition, or in unison with,"

Lieblieh in der Brüte Locken
Spielt der jungfräuliche Kranz,
Wenn die hellen Kirchenglocken
Laden zu des Festes Glanz.

In my opinion, Professor Hewett has done too much also in the way of translating the text. I believe with Professor Thomas who says in his edition of 'Tasso,' "much help of that sort is baneful." There is hardly a page of notes, on which there is not an uncalled-for translation, according to my judgment. If *erleben*, *zaudern* (twice), *durch einander*, *kramen*, *sengen*, *Mitgift* do not mean respectively 'experience,' 'hesitate,' 'pell-mell,' 'rummage,' 'scorch,' 'dowry,' what do they mean? These translations are only superfluous, those of whole phrases and sentences are positively injurious. Examples are, not to go beyond the second canto: 'Elegie,' 8, 9, 29; i, 89; ii, 202, 206, 220, 241. Some of the translations cannot be called happy ones, to say the least. In i, 94 *Spuren* is rendered by 'remains'; in vi, 61, 'despair rouses in the heart many an atrocious enterprize.' In vii, 195 *noch* does not mean 'additional.' The proverb in iii, 66, "Wer nicht vorwärts geht, der kommt zurücke" need not be looked for in classical, that is, in Greek or Latin literature; for *der Allen* in the preceding line probably means 'of the forefathers.'

If, in vi, 5, *schrecklicher* is construed as an appositive adjective in the genitive plural it cannot be translated 'years to us more terrible.' In v, 140 *Wage* is rendered by 'whiffletree' and 'spring-bar-tree.' What is this last word? A 'spring-tree-bar' is spooking through all the German-English dictionaries, but it is not to be found in the 'Century Dictionary.' I half suspect it is a phantom word and that Professor Hewett's 'spring-bar-tree' is its double. Still it would be difficult to say which language, German or English, has more terms for this part of the wagon. Here are a few: 'whiffletree,' 'swingletree,' 'singletree,' 'splinter-bar,' 'evener,' *Schwengel*, *Klippschwengel*, *Sprengwage*, *Ortschaft*, *Wagscheit*, *Zugscheit*, *Wacht*. Cholevius' statement, quoted by Professor Hewett, that *Brake* is used in many districts where *Wage* is unknown,

may be true, but it is not the whole truth. I take it, Cholevius' *Brake* stands for *Bracke*, which is both in Grimm and Sanders.

There is also too much etymology in the notes. Students that are expected to profit by O.H.G. and M.H.G. quotations, and are referred to Braune's O.H.G. grammar may be supposed to have access to Kluge, Skeat and Grimm. Many very likely own the first two. Heyne has just reached the word *Römer* in Grimm, and what he gives supersedes, in my opinion, Skeat's statements as to 'rummer,' in the note on i, 168. It may be questioned whether *Mütze* in i, 37 and iv, 167 means *Schlafmütze*, if by that is meant *Nachtmütze*. It is rather something like a smoking or fatigue cap, intermediate between the stiff hat and the *négligé* nightcap. *Nächte* in viii, 56 and ix, 10, is interpreted as an archaic genitive singular. It is very questionable to my mind, whether the M.H.G. *nehte*, genitive singular of the *i*-stem, has survived in the literary language of the end of the eighteenth century. There are no examples in Grimm. The genitive plural would not be so unusual here. There are four illustrative examples in Grimm *sub Nacht*. Many will dissent from the statement that F. Vischer's criticism of iv, 199 is not justifiable. The line does smack of Rousseau, Philine and the Roman Elegies! The note on iii, 41 states that both *auf* and *an* are used with *denken*. But with a marked difference! *Dräuen* is said to be "even common in Luther," viii, 11. I am not sure what this "even" means. Heyne says, that *drohen* does not occur in Luther, but does occur in the sixteenth century, and predominates since the end of the seventeenth. I have found *dräuwen* and *bedräuwen* five times in a Bible of the year 1563, once in three reprints of Luther's smaller writings, but *drohen* not once.

Professor Hewett's notes suffer still from a certain unevenness and crudeness which no doubt a second edition will remove. The misprints in the illustrative quotations are sometimes very annoying. Take the last one. It is from Arndt, credited to Grimm's 'Dictionary.' Heyne has put an explanatory phrase "unter den Sonnen" at the end of the last line. These words have slidden down one line, so that Professor Hewett makes it appear,

that the quotation is from one of Arndt's poems headed, "Unter den Sonnen." Under v. 147, Graf Eberhard der Rauschebart appears as an author. The sources of a number of quotations are not given at all; as, under v, 57; or merely the author, or book and chapter, or act and scene are given; as, under iii, 9, 22; ii, 157; v, 179; vi, 191; viii, 88. Under iii, 9, *Liebhaberin* for *Liebhaberei*, must be a misprint, but I cannot hunt up the source. Why are the O.H.G. and M.H.G. single words and quotations generally put in German type, when the accented vowels had to be put in Latin type? In the following notes the text is not quoted correctly: ii, 83; ii, 154, 167; vi, 253; ix, 51. Notes that are not clear, or cannot be made out at all, are those on i, 3 (last line), 122, 158, 195; ii, 57, 220; iv, 93; vi, 44; ix, 79. What is meant by "the expectation of the new scene is fore-indicated," on p. 131?

There are a number of what may be called belated notes. The one on v, 185 was evidently intended for i, 117 where *Kaarn* and *Wagen* occur together. The one on ii, 258 should have been on i, 21. If *selig* was to be translated at all, it should have been in ii, 90, not in ix, 17. There are six more of such notes, but some of them have references.

Some notes are inconsistent with each other, if not contradictory. Before the difference between *sondern* and *aber* has been stated in notes on v, 179 and vii, 52, *aber* is given as the force of *und* in ii, 98 and 110, when its force is clearly *sondern*. Under vi, 193, the primitive meaning of *milde* is said to be 'generously.' This does not harmonize with the statement under i, 13. *Gelassen* and *geduldig* are distinguished under ii, 27, yet in vi, 49 the first is translated by 'patient.'

While the notes are abundant and ample, some repeated and some *malapropos*, there are also those that are too meagre; and some points that should have had notes, in my opinion, have none. Under ix, 46, we are told that Lessing's little work 'Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet haben' (*sic*) had an incredible influence. How many students will know how, why? Under viii, 3 much is made of older *Blick* for the now common *Blitz*, but that *Blitz* is a derivative of *Blick* is not mentioned. The difficult construction: *er sagt' es ihr denn*,

in iv, 43, needs more elucidation than a mere paraphrase with an added *nicht*. Students want to know where the *nicht* comes from. The phonetic relation of *dräuen* and *drohen* might have been explained under viii, 11. How is it, that Cæsar wore a wreath *aus Bedürfnis*, 'Elegie,' 18? The mere quoting of Heine's "Die Luft ist kühl und es dunkelt" does not explain *den dunkelnden Pfad* in viii, 38. Peculiar are *Fabriken* which means 'manufacture' in i, 58; *verdunkelt* in ii, 84; the accusative *wenige Stunden*, in iv, 193; *den Tag lebt*, in vi, 310; *an's Ohr hin*, in vii, 190; the dative *künftigen Zeiten*, in ix, 257; *in Sinn*, in iii, 107; *Stunden*, in v, 21; *mit Freuden*, in ii, 50; *bei Rat*, in iv, 175.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

Hamilton College.

CHAUCER.

Studies in Chaucer: His Life and Writings.

By THOMAS R. LOUNSBURY, Professor of English in the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University. In three volumes. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892.

THE twenty-fifth birthday of the foundation of the Chaucer Society has been most fittingly celebrated. Professor Lounsbury's 'Studies in Chaucer' combine in forming a complete record and a critical appreciation of the multifarious results won from the researches of the past quarter of a century. It must have been a very pleasant duty for Professor Lounsbury to dedicate his work to Professor Child, the veritable pioneer in Chaucerian studies.

The readers of these three octavo volumes, covering over fifteen hundred pages of scholarly criticism, will congratulate themselves that the author could not find satisfaction in his earlier "intention of putting together in a compendious and easily accessible form the results of the latest investigations." Interesting indeed would have been a convenient summary of all the material gathered under the title of the publications of the Chaucer Society, but how much more intrinsically valuable are these exhaustive treatises which the writer concluded to set for his task.

In these eight chapters, each so written as to form a complete monograph in itself, Pro-

fessor Lounsbury approaches his subject essentially as a critic, for he has labored not merely to record former researches, but also to examine the possible value of those self-styled investigations. The biography of the poet elicits the first exercise of this critical faculty. Chaucer and Shakespeare have had voluminous biographies to offset the little that has been known of their lives. Professor Lounsbury has not thought it advisable to interweave the story-threads of the poet's life with some fantastic arrangement of his works. Professor ten Brink chose such a plan for his sketch of Chaucer in his 'History of English Literature,' despite the trouble and ill success he encountered in the disposition of so much undated material. On reading the scheme invented by Professor ten Brink one hardly agrees that the "ABC" poem bears a post-Italian stamp; that the tales of Virginia and Greselda, the preamble of the Wyf of Bath, the story of May and January offer many clues to assist in their arrangement. In chapter i, Professor Lounsbury rejects all traditional statements, presents the few dates and events now recognized as being the only true material for a biographical notice, and discusses at great length and with equally great thoroughness the question of the date of Chaucer's birth, leaving the reader at the end of forty pages with the happy information that "born sometime Chaucer certainly was."

In chapter ii we are led along a gallery of productions depicting a series of most romantic biographical legends. The author says that "in the biography of no other man of letters can there, perhaps, be found such a record" of absurd stories.

Before entering upon a criticism of the poet's works, time is called, and chapter iii tells of the text of Chaucer before and after the introduction of printing. The early editions have passed through much the same mode of treatment as the poet's biography—the more, the better. A tabulation of the various editions and their dates would have presented to the reader's eye a distinct outline of the facts related in the chapter itself.

Chapter iv, "the Writings of Chaucer," is not a critical review of the sources, subject-matter, motives and literary significance of the

poet's works, but a history of the method used in rejecting the spurious productions and saving the genuine. The ascription to Chaucer of all sorts of poetry regardless of all laws of criticism has brought into existence a number of remedies called "tests of genuineness" which Professor Lounsbury groups into two classes; the first including tests of personal or contemporary testimony, manuscript test, the grammatical test; the second, tests of dialect and rime, the *ye* and *y* test, rhetorical test, tests of vocolulary and others. The second class of tests is claimed to be corroboratory, but not conclusive. Take, for example, the poem entitled "The Flower and the Leaf." It is unpleasant enough to submit such a beautiful poem to this trial. As a poetic symbol, the contest between the flower and the leaf must have been familiar to Chaucer and his successors, for they could have read it not only in three poems by Eustache Deschamps, but also in a fourth ode bearing still closer resemblance to the poem before us. The first class of tests cannot be used, but the frequent employment of the *ye* and *y* rime, and the misuse of the rules for rime dependent upon grammatical terminations, are sufficient to prove the spuriousness of the poem. Not so easily dispatched is the "Romance of the Rose." The proofs for the unguineness of this work, collected by Professor Skeat, are weighty and numerous, in fact, weighty and numerous enough to win over Professor ten Brink. Yet there was plenty of room for controversy, and Professor Lounsbury has entered the field. How successfully? The reader alone must decide, for it is a question involving many and insoluble difficulties. It stands thus, the "strongest evidence against the genuineness of this version of the 'Roman de la Rose' is the auxiliary use of the present *do*," while the "strongest sort of evidence for its genuineness is the Chaucerian character of the translation." It is the constant occurrence of Chaucer's words, phrases, mannerisms, methods of translation as well as independent expressions, which goes to prove the genuineness of the poem and the insufficiency of Professor Skeat's arguments. But in advancing this so-called literary test, Professor Lounsbury readily foresaw a possible demurrer,

urging that all these various expressions which have been enumerated are not really distinctive; that the very inevitableness of their constant employment is of itself evidence that they cannot be so. It may be further maintained that Chaucer and the author of this translation were both doing no more than making use of the common phraseology of the time. It is true that the comparison of Chaucer's works with those of any contemporary must be inadequate, because "no great body of contemporary rhymed production of different authors exists." But is Gower the representative? Many of the words and phrases cited as notably frequent in Chaucer are stereotyped alliterative forms. Such phrases are: *soth to say, sothly to say, withouten wene, were, black as a berry, woundes . . wide, faire fresshe, swelte and swete*. What we wish to emphasize is that these are formal alliterative phrases, and as such are less known and employed by Gower than by any contemporary writer named or nameless. And equally inadequate for comparison seem to be the parallel passages selected from the genuine works of Chaucer. The subject requires much wider illustration than has been attempted in both this chapter and the appendix. The poetic vocabulary of Chaucer and his contemporaries is surprisingly traditional, is almost too formal and similar to allow a satisfactory line of proof.

Chapter v, "The Learning of Chaucer," is an interesting subject that has never before been presented so entertainingly. The frequent citation of authors and authorities, the many recently discovered originals and parallels evince an extensive, though perhaps not a scholarly, store of learning on the poet's part. If no praise is to be awarded Chaucer for knowing Latin and French in these words,

"To be an educated man at all, one had to know Latin. . . In some things French could take its place, but it could not fill it. Both of these tongues were the common possession of every one in England of the fourteenth century who aimed to be a man of letters at all. In knowing them Chaucer would have no special distinction over many of his contemporaries," we prefer to pass a few pages and read

"Chaucer, accordingly, could not have failed to meet with it [respect for knowledge of three languages besides his own] in an age

when familiarity with foreign tongues implied a great deal more than it does now."

It is not surprising that the great book of the Renaissance of literature, the 'Roman de la Rose,' should have made such an impression on the young English poet as to have colored his poetic vision more than "all other French poetry put together." Probably Chaucer began the translation of this great masterpiece and of Boethius's 'De Consolatione Philosophiae' in his youth, for we have hardly a piece of work from his pen in which their influence has not been felt. Among the French writers with whom Chaucer is styled acquainted is Eustache Deschamps. The latter's poem dedicated to the "great translator" confirms this claim though "not a single line of the English poet has so far been traced" to him. Froissart's name, then, should not have been omitted from this list of French writers. It is true that Chaucer's name occurs only in the chronicler's account of the negotiations of 1377 at Montreuil, but there is the borrowed passage, though who enjoys the obligation is a question, showing a literary indebtedness at least. And Professor Skeat writes:

"When we come to Chaucer we recognise in him one who was a great student of the poetry of France, and was well acquainted with the writings of Guillaume de Machault, Jean de Froissart and others."

The second volume closes with a review, chapter vi, of Chaucer's relation to the English language and to the religion of his time. Certainly the poet exercised a marked influence upon the language of his time, but just how to describe his attitude towards Wycliffe is a more difficult undertaking. Anything like a thorough treatise upon Chaucer's English and that of his contemporaries cannot be written until more research has been made. It is not enough to glance at the poet's vocabulary, to average up the French and Anglo-Saxon elements in it. Dr. Eugen Einenkel has given a model of the method necessary to such a task; it is eminently a work of comparison; it involves a study of phrases as well as of words; not only of Chaucer, but also of his contemporaries and predecessors. It is right to conclude that Chaucer's English became the language of English literature not

because he rejected and selected words, but because he made those already in use the medium of his own expression. Professor Lounsbury truly observes.

"His work, in consequence, was the first effectual barrier that literature raised against the rapid change then going on in our speech."

"Chaucer in Literary History" is entitled chapter vii. Interest in Chaucer is a just indicator of the literary taste of any age. All honor, therefore, is due the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries for the admiration of the great English poet. The cultivation of Chaucer touched lowest point in the middle and end of the seventeenth century. The eighteenth still continued ignorant and indifferent with respect to him. This indifference, Professor Lounsbury says, resulted from the "lack of knowledge, and not from the lack of intelligence."

Tyrwhitt's edition of the "Canterbury Tales," in 1775, "heralded the coming of a new order of things." And admiration for the poet has enrolled many a name famous in English literature from the days of Wordsworth to Lowell. But in view of the pleasure stored up for the reader in the eighth and final chapter, it is impossible to tarry and discuss the modernization of Chaucer in orthography and pronunciation.

In this closing monograph Professor Lounsbury purposes to present Chaucer as a literary artist, to discuss the poet's characteristic qualities in order to uphold the assertion previously made that Chaucer was an artist in the "fabrication of his verse as well as in the construction of his plot and the telling of his story." In face of all the elaborate study made by Professor ten Brink, of an attempted construction of the poet's biography based on the technical development of his poetic genius and versification, is it not misleading to write?—

"In the various eulogistic tributes that have been paid to the poet, it is rare that it [the technical part of his work] has received even cursory notice. In none of them has it ever been credited with its full significance."

Certainly Chaucer's attitude towards literature was a critical one, yet that could not keep him from some of the evils of his age, and one of these was a something wont to be called "prolixity." But we are now told that this is

not it. It is his "improper introduction of extraneous matter," "this is a fault of constructive skill, but it is not a fault of expression."

There is no reason to fear that Sandras's attack upon Chaucer's originality will mislead the student of Chaucer. Professor Ebert met Sandras long since and conquered him. And who can forget those glowing words penned by Lowell (and we quote these because no mention is made of Mr. Lowell's essay on 'Chaucer')?—

"Chaucer seems to me to have been one of the most purely original of poets, as much so in respect of the world that is about us as Dante in respect of that which is within us. He is original, not in the sense that he thinks and says what nobody ever thought and said before, and what nobody can ever think and say again, but because he is always natural, because, if not always absolutely new, he is always delightfully fresh, because he sets before us the world as it honestly appeared to Geoffrey Chaucer, and not a world as it seemed proper to certain people that it ought to appear."

There are many traits of Chaucer which reveal the very highest type of originality, that conscious impulse to herald the dawn of the new birth, the renaissance, that prophetic glimpse into the sublimer realm of English literature, the drama.

This entire eighth chapter is a memorial of studious praise; it fearlessly sets forth the principles of true art and submits to their criticism an artist known by the author to be superior to their most searching tests. Professor Lounsbury has expressed an appreciation of that second greatest of English poets in words which will not fail to charm the reader, to awaken his enthusiasm and to instruct him, and the Professor's grand work will stamp this age as one that will be "reputed eminent for learning" because of the extent to which it has become learned in Chaucer and his writings.

The beauty and expensive dress of these volumes, their excellent typography and wide-margined pages are most complimentary to the skill and liberality of Professor Lounsbury's publishers.

CHARLES FLINT MCCLUMPHA.

University of the City of New York.

GERMAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARIES.

A Universal English-German and German-English Dictionary by Dr. FELIX FLÜGEL. Fourth, entirely remodelled, edition of Dr. J. G. FLÜGEL's Complete Dictionary of the English and German Languages, Braunschweig: George Westermann, 1891.

Encyclopaedic English-German and German-English Dictionary. Uniform in plan and arrangement with Sachs-Villate's French-German and German-French Dictionary. By Professor Dr. ED. MURET. Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1891.— [A.—Brahmin.]

The announcement of the fourth completely revised edition of 'Flügel' may serve as a convenient occasion for alluding briefly to the principal publications which have already appeared in the same field. One of the earliest as well as the most imposing is 'Lucas,' a bulky jumble of heterogeneous definition, expensive and scarce. 'Hilpert' is voluminous and still valuable, but somewhat out of date and hard to find. 'Grieb' is more modern, but enlarges only slightly the vocabulary of its plundered predecessors. For ordinary purposes the most available dictionary at present would be either 'Thieme-Preusser' or 'Cassell-Heath.' The former is more detailed and notes the accent of German words; the latter, for its size, is remarkably comprehensive and fresh. Both contain many recent terms, although neither has been revised sufficiently to indicate to those who desire them all the recent changes in orthography, nor does either treat pronunciation with satisfactory thoroughness, or the nomenclature of persons and places. 'Whitney' is suggestive in etymologies, but is meagre in definition and specially inadequate in the English-German portion. 'Longmans' is a truly admirable pocket dictionary—for the overcoat. As yet there is nothing in German to match the marvelous 'Dictionnaire de Poche' of John Bellows. Numerous other mediocre works also exist, until the list dwindles down finally to the insignificant 'Feller.' 'Hoppe,' at present far from complete (Berlin, 1888, A-Close), if ever finished on the same scale as the initial part, is to be an elaborate and invaluable English-German Dictionary. 'Muret,' now going through the press, includ-

ing many biographical and encyclopedic details, seems to be the only formidable rival of 'Flügel' as a fairly exhaustive work of reference. Among the characteristics of 'Muret' is an elaborate system, carried out with bewildering thoroughness, of typographical devices to convey a variety of condensed information by means of conventional pictured signs, together with a large number of general and special orthoëpic symbols, and an abundance of familiar and unfamiliar abbreviations. These signs and symbols and abbreviations are all carefully explained either upon the margins or in an appropriate introduction. The page is rendered somewhat uncomely, but to one who has mastered the key the advantage is obvious. The prospectus declares that the vocabulary is the richest and most complete of its kind, and supports the claim by a comparative count of 'Murray,' the 'Century,' the 'Imperial,' 'Webster,' 'Flügel,' etc., from *A* to *Achaean*, in which Muret's name leads all the rest. A reviewer in the *Nation*, however, (March 19, 1891) has already indicated that this plurality is partly gained by a padding of geographical names; and, it might have been added, by the incorporation of many simple compounds, of a number of rare or obsolete words, and of the riches of our scientific and technical terminology. But this very explanation will betray the copious nature of the work. Although it lacks the literary finish in execution and the abundance of quotation from English authors which adorn 'Flügel,' it promises to be a masterpiece of conscientious and comprehensive lexicography. A more detailed examination of its contents must naturally be deferred until the issue has progressed further.

Of the nature and scope of the German-English part we have as yet no information beyond the general announcement, which presents as editor the weighty name of Prof. Daniel Sanders. The revised orthography is to be employed. The publication of the whole work is professedly to be completed within about six years, but according to most precedents this *terminus ad quem* will be extended into the next century. Meanwhile we have in 'Flügel' an excellent guide to carry us over the interval.

Looking more closely at the latter work, we find that the external appearance leaves little to be desired. The typographical treatment of the page is admirable, and forms a strong æsthetic contrast to the appearance of Muret's columns, which bristle like the field of Cadmus.

The German-English part contains 923 three-column pages, while the English-German portion requires about double that space. This is partly occasioned by the liberal supply of quotations from English writers, illustrating historically the use of the word under discussion. These quotations are drawn from the standard English and American classics of the last two or three centuries, with a considerable proportion from recent literature, and are so judiciously chosen that they will be as interesting to the English reader as they must be edifying to the foreign student. In citations from Shakspeare, an occasional happy translation by Tieck or others has been utilized.

The usual number of tables of verbs and nouns, and keys for pronunciation, have been appended, while proper names, geographical and biographical terms, and in short the whole substance of such appendices as those of Webster and Worcester, where employed, is spread through the main vocabulary. The range of definition is generous, and includes not merely the current literary vocabulary, but technical terms, slang, and the special nomenclature of the various sciences. The terminology of botany, mining, ornithology, for instance, and of the sea, seems well represented, and phrases from Latin and the modern languages find a place. The familiar names of classic fable appear in profusion, but many of the characters of Germanic mythology are left shivering in outer darkness. We note the *Asen*, to be sure, but not all of their individual representatives. In these days of the worship of Wagner if not of Klopstock, the names of *Loki* and his fellows ought not to fail; nor should *Brunhilde* and *Chriemhilde*, *Siegfried* and *Hagen* be conspicuously wanting. If *Apollo* is given, why not *Baldur*? If *Aphrodite*, why not *Frau Holda*? But while *Hercules* and *Cerberus* and *Oceanus* are there, *Fenrir* is absent, and *Fafnir* and *Grendel*, as well as *Heimdall* and the tree *Yggdrasil*.

The terminology of scientific grammar, in-

cluding phonology, has also been treated somewhat meagrely. This meagre treatment, however, is in large measure due to what Dr. Wright, the talented translator of a part of Brugmann's comparative grammar, styles "the poverty-stricken state of our language as regards current philological technical terms." It would indeed be a boon to the beginner in philological research if some competent hand were to collect and elucidate in a special and compact vocabulary the corresponding terms in both languages which are peculiar to the study of linguistics. This work has already been done in part by the translators of Paul and of Braune, of Brugmann, of Kluge, and of Behaghel.

Further, the common parlance of the card table may be found, although not all the special terms are given. *Slam* and *ruff* and *rubber* appear in both parts, but *finesse* is omitted. *Revoke* is given, but not *deny*; and *cross-ruff* appears only under *Zwickmühle*.—The terms of the game of cricket, which German schools are beginning to practice, have not been incorporated.

The discussion of adverbs and prepositions in both parts is thoroughly satisfactory, a desirable feature in view of the unfinished 'Grimm' and the inadequate treatment in 'Sanders.' To verify this, one needs merely to open the work at random, for instance at *ab*, *an*, *auf*, *aus*, *bei*, *bis*, *her*, *hin*, *von*, *vor*, *zu*; or at *about*, *abroad*, *across*, *after*, *between*, *for*, *on*, *out*, *over*, *to*, *under*.

The idioms with verbs are fully presented, as may be seen in the articles *break*, *come*, *do*, *get*, *let*, *make*, *put*, *throw*, and the corresponding German words. Note, for instance, *gehen*, *lassen*, *machen*, *stehen*. Words such as *cully*, *deemster*, *Dixie*, *Downing Street*, *Drawcan-sir*, *ducdame*, *Minerva Press*, *Nimini-pimini*, *sawney*, *slyboots*, *storge*, *touch-and-go*, *wegot-ism*, illustrate the variety of definition, while articles like *bill*, *body*, *eye*, *fall*, *Miss*, *run*, *self*, *she*, *sir*, *take*, *turn*, *way*, *what*, or *Auge*, *Glück*, *Kopf*, *Schlag*, *schon*, *Zug*, will show the thoroughness with which the meanings and use of a term have been traced. Another valuable feature of the work may be found in the articles on the various letters, where many useful abbreviations are grouped. Variations

of pronunciations are carefully indicated, as in *clerk, contrite, desiccate, Elizabethan, imbecile, levant, prow, reverie*, and many others. The revised orthography has not been used, and scientific etymology has been attempted. The latter omission needs no explanation, but one might well be curious to learn the views which in the former case have prompted so conservative a course. Perchance these views may be given in the Supplement, which has not yet appeared.

HORATIO S. WHITE.

Cornell University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

La gesta del Cid Raccolte e Ordinate dal Prof. ANTONIO RESTORI. Milano: Hoepli. 1890. 8vo, pp. 272.

THIS is "una cretomazia speciale delle opere e dei documenti spagnoli concernenti il Cid." In addition to many extracts from the 'Poema del Cid,'—about a third of the entire poem is given, the various passages being connected by a running analysis,—Restori has here collected a large quantity of material from sources that are not easily accessible. As no text of the 'Poema' has appeared since that of Vollmöller (1879), which is long since out of print, this part of Restori's book will serve a very useful purpose.

In addition, the volume contains extracts from the 'Cronica Rimada,' the romances, poems, dramas and novels in which the Cid material has been treated in Spanish literature; the whole being followed by a good glossary and an index of proper names.

However excellent the Chrestomathy of Restori may be in other respects, his method of scansion of the 'Poema' certainly seems remarkable. The measure he has used may not be intended for the eye, but the question is, will it adopt itself to the ear? It would have been very interesting, if, in his Introduction, Restori had again briefly given his views about the metre of the poem, as his article in the *Propugnatore*, to which he refers, is not easily within reach. Of this part of his work Baist says:

"die metrische Auffassung ist die unhaltbarste, welche noch dem Denkmal entgegen gebracht worden ist."²

¹ *Literaturblatt*, December 1891, col. 411.

Much has been written upon the versification of the 'Cid,' the latest article that has appeared being by Cornu in his "Études sur le Poème du Cid," in the 'Études Romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris.'² Here Cornu comes back to the opinion expressed by Pidal forty years ago, that the 'Poema del Cid' is written in the measure of the old *romances*. Baist does not think that Cornu has proven his theory, nor does he think that the alexandrine is the basis of the poem. Cornu, p. 420, says:

"On peut donner plusieurs preuves que le vers de quatorze syllabes, coupé en deux moitiés par les éditeurs de romances, est aussi celui du P. du Cid, quoique, dans l'état où il nous est parvenu, la versification y soit excessivement maltraitée."

The weakest of these proofs, Cornu continues, is that which may be deduced from the verses "which remained safe and sound in the not very faithful memory of Per Abbat," and he gives a number of fourteen syllable verses: all in all, such sound verses make up about one third of the whole poem. A better proof, he says, may be found in the 'Cronica Rimada,' "but the best proof of all to establish that the verse of fourteen syllables is that employed by the poet, we find in the half-verses which contain proper names,"

of which he gives a classified list. Such are:

Peso [eut] a Albardiaz. 2042.

El castiello de Alcoçer. 569.

Pesa a los de Alcoçer. 861, etc.

Whatever view of the metre of the 'Poema del Cid' may be taken, it is certainly impossible, in the present corrupt state of the text,—the MSS. in the opinion of Prof. Baist being of the fourteenth century,—to force the thirty-seven hundred odd verses into any uniform measure.

A few examples of Restori's method are subjoined:

De los sos oios tan | fuerte mientre lorando. 1.

E sin falcones e | sin adtores mudados. 5.

Los de dentro non les | quieren tornar palabra. 36.

Myo Çid Ruy Diaz, el | que en buen ora çinxo espada. 58.

Non lo compra ca el | se lo avie çonsigo. 67.

Ya lo vedes que | el rrey le a ayrado. 114.

H. A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

² Paris, Bouillon, 1891.

INTRODUCTORY FRENCH READER.

Introductory French Reader by WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College, and M. P. WHITNEY. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1891. 16mo, 256 pp.

THE mere announcement of a book prepared by such an approved teacher as Professor Whitney would lead us to look for a work of unusual merit and, in the present instance, this expectation is fully realized. We have here a book not made up of scraps and little anecdotes, but of selections of some length, mostly from approved masters.

The first part contains seven selections averaging ten pages each, among them two translations from the Brothers Grimm; to these some purists will probably object, but the majority of teachers will approve of them. The objection sometimes made to such selections is that they are not French literature, but to those using this book they will be literature quite as much as the selections from Lamartine or Daudet. Like Hamlet, beginners read "words, words" and words only and the chief thing to be considered is that these words be so collocated as to make easy and interesting reading.

The second part contains nine selections, also averaging ten pages each. Here are represented such writers as George Sand, Dumas, Michelet, Thiers, Lamartine and Daudet. The only objection that can be made to these is that they are rather difficult for beginners, certainly for young beginners, and this objection will have all the more weight when we see that the notes are very scanty, hardly averaging one to a page in the second part. There are many places where pupils, even the best, will not be able to understand the text. Take, for example, the following from p. 108:

... nous donnons la caille pour boire au garçon.

Here the pupil would almost certainly translate:

"We gave the boy the quail to drink," in spite of the fact that this would be nonsense. Most pupils, especially beginners, seem to think that what is written in a foreign language

need not necessarily make sense when put into English.

Again, in making French and German textbooks it is, unfortunately, necessary to take into consideration the fact that many teachers have only the merest smattering of the language they are teaching, and the notes should be made with reference to this state of things. On this account, the historical notes in Professor Whitney's 'Reader' should be more copious. Even with the best intentions, neither teacher nor pupil will always know where to turn for information on obscure points, or may not always have at hand the necessary reference book.

The third part, finally, contains nine short poems, mostly by poets of the first rank.

In a cursory examination, the following words have been missed from the vocabulary: *caritas*, *compâtir*, *foudroyé*, *humaniser*. P. 151, l. 11, *ancien* occurs as a noun meaning 'veteran,' a sense not given in the vocabulary. So also *levant*, 164, l. 21, means 'dawning,' and *hors*, 167, l. 18, means 'except.'

The following misprints have been noted: p. 14, l. 30, *très-contents* for *très contents*, an error which frequently occurs throughout the book; 161, l. 13, *père* for *père*; 163, l. 14, *la* for *là*; 177, l. 8, *regicide* for *régicide*; 177, l. 14, *un* for *une*; 178, l. 5, *à* for *à*.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

AN OLD ENGLISH INSCRIPTION IN BRUSSELS.

L'Inscription Anglo-Saxonne du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix au Trésor de l'Église des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles. Par H. LOGEMAN. Gand and Leipzig: H. Engelcke, 1891.

+ RODISMINNAMAGEOICRICNECYNINGBÆRBYFIGYNDE
BLODEBESTEMEDPASRODEHETEPLMERWYRICAN7ADH
ELWOLDHYSBEROPOCRISTETOLOFEOFELFRICESSAVLE
HYRABEROPOR.

Such is the inscription that Dr. Logeman has found on a strip of silver belonging to the reliquary of a reputed piece of the true cross at the Cathedral of Brussels. On the back of the cross itself are the letters:

DRAHMALEWORTHE.

And in a different place on the back:

AGNUS DEI.

The first inscription readily resolves itself into:

"Rôð is mīn nama; géo ic rīcne cyning bær, byfigynde, blóde bestémed. pás rôðe hét Æþlmar wyrīcan, 7 Adhelwold hys berôþo, Crīste tó lofe, for Ælfrīces sáule hyra berôþ-or."

And the second into:

"Drahmal mé worhte. Agnus Dei."

Similarly the translation of the Old English would be:

"Rood is my name. Whilom I bore the powerful king, trembling, suffused with blood. This cross Æthelmar had made and Athelwold his brother, to the glory of Christ for the soul of Ælfric their brother."

"Drahmal wrought me."

Logeman, from the evidence of language, inclines to fix the date of the longer inscription at about 1100. That of iconography is less authoritative, but the shorter inscription may be approximately referred to the ninth or tenth century.

How the cross with its silver plate found its way from England to the Continent is another question, into which Logeman enters at some length. Possibly, he thinks, it might be the very piece of the true cross that Pope Marinus sent King Alfred, when, at the request of the king, he freed from taxes and tribute the English school at Rome. The English Chronicle contains the record under 883 and 885 (Earle, pp. 83-4):

"And Marinus pápa sēnde pá lignum dñi Ælfrēde cyngē."

"And þý ilcan géare forþfērde se góða pápa Marinus, se gefrēode Ongelcynnes scole be Ælfrēdes béne Westseaxna cyninges, and hé sēnde him micla gifa, and þære rôðe dēl þe Crīst on þrówude."

For the manner in which Logeman was led to the discovery, the development of his theories, and the presentation of further facts bearing on the subject, the student must be referred to the pamphlet itself, which, originally contained in Vol. xlv of the 'Mémoires couronnés et autres Mémoires' published by the Royal Academy of Belgium, is here published separately as a neat tract of 31 pages, to which are appended two excellent photographic facsimiles.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHICK, CHICKEN, CHICKENS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Many years ago I read in De Vere's 'Studies in English,'

"Our word kitten was originally the plural of *kit*, a diminutive made from *cat*, according to early Gothic usage, the *c* being changed to *k* to preserve its hard sound before the vowel *i*, just as we change *candle* into *kindle*. In like manner *cock* makes first *chick*, and then the plural *chicken*, which we now use as a singular by the side of the former, for 'a pretty chick,' is still a common expression, and 'the old gentleman had neither *chick* nor child,' used by Warren, shows the former meaning. It was only about the time of Wallis, as he tells us himself, that *chicken* began to lose its plural meaning; and we are told that in Sussex, to this day, the people would as soon think of saying *oxens* as *chickens*."

The reference to Dr. Wallis is perhaps sufficiently definite and the somewhat dubious "we are told" is probably owing to the popular character of Professor De Vere's book. Nevertheless later etymologists, among them Professor Skeat, regard the *-en* in *chicken* and *maiden* as diminutive endings found as early as the Gothic. The fact that we have *cicen* in the A.-S. seems to prove that in some of the Germanic dialects the final *-en* was not a sign of the plural. But it would not be safe to infer from the fragmentary evidence of existing authorities that this is true of all. Under *chick* the 'Oxford Dictionary' says:

"A shortened form of *chicken*. Probably in its origin merely a phonetic development, the final *-n* being, in some dialects, lost, as in the inflexion of nouns and verbs, and the resulting *-e* then disappearing in the ordinary way."

One of the pamphlets of the English Dialect Society says that in some parts of Kent *chicken* is used as a plural of which the singular is *chick*. This puts the word in the same class with *oxen*, *kine*, *hosen*, and several others. The evidence here adduced can hardly be disputed; and yet the fact that Wiclif, has the plural *chykenys*, and 'Piers P.' *chickens*, seems to prove that the statement of Wallis is not true of England as a whole.

It is, of course, possible that the superfluous plural *-en-s* is unique, but the probability would be much greater if one or more analogous

cases could be found. Double plurals as *sus-tren* and *sisters*; *peases* and *peasen*, with many more of the same sort, to say nothing of those in *-en-e* are common enough; this is, however, not nearly the same thing as two endings in one and the same word. But there is, at least, one other double plural, which seems to be unique, namely, *children*. It is of such common occurrence that its history can be traced step by step from its earliest appearance, while the dialectic plural *childer* is still frequently heard. I have even met with the plural *childers*, which is no more illogical than its literary equivalent. On the whole it seems questionable whether it is correct to consider the final syllables in *kitt-en*, *maid-en* and *chick-en* as identical. There is much evidence in favor of regarding the *-en* in *maiden* as a feminine ending occurring in Greek as *-ivva* or *-iva*; in Latin as *-ina*; and in Gothic as *-ein*. The fact that the congeners of *chick* in many of the Germanic dialects append a diminutive syllable, gives color to the notion that the *-en* in English has the same force. On the other hand, there seems little doubt that it was not so regarded everywhere; for it is well known that it performs a variety of functions. It is not likely that the question can ever be definitely decided as to the real nature of this terminal syllable in *chicken*; but it seems safe to assume that it is not the same that occurs in *maiden*. Whatever may have been its ultimate origin it is not unreasonable to suppose that in the course of time the *-en* in *chicken* came to be regarded in some sections as a plural ending; in others a diminutive. So far as I have been able to observe, *chicken* is not at present generally used as a diminutive, *little chicken* being usually employed as the equivalent of *chick*. The most general use of *chicken* is as an equivalent of *hen*; and while *hen* and *chickens* is not infrequent it is not nearly so common as *old hen* and *little chickens*.

CHAS. W. SUPER.

Ohio University.

INTRODUCTORY FRENCH READER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Many teachers who are using some one of the Whitney* series of French Gram-

* 'Introductory French Reader' by William Dwight Whitney and M. P. Whitney, New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1891. 16mo, 256 pp.

mars will welcome the appearance of this reader, especially for the sake of the full grammatical references that apply alike to all three of the grammars in the series just mentioned. Beginning students are, on the whole, more apt to make better use of such helps than those who are advanced; and it certainly saves a teacher labor to have definite references to a well-known grammar, especially if it happens to be the grammar he is using. The obvious advantage that this 'Reader' possesses for use in connection with other text-books of the Whitney collection, might be a difficulty in the way of using it with grammars by other authors. The tri-partite arrangement and the character of the material selected for each part are not unlike other favorably known collections.

Notes that are easy to use, clear, not too voluminous, a table of irregular verbs, and references from each verb as given in the vocabulary to the table, an open, attractive page—these all are commendable things. The reference catalogue of the irregular verbs is especially noted in the preface, and the hope expressed that it may lessen one of the chief difficulties met by beginners. It will do this to a certain extent, but why will not some one go further, and give a simple lexicographic treatment of the irregular verbs in an elementary reader? Let *vais*, for example, be found near the top of the *v*-column with the definition, (I) 'go, from *aller*' not "see *aller*"; and when the student has turned to *aller* a further reference meets him: "see No. 66," in some grammar or in the back part of the book he is using. The irregular verb-forms are, after all, words much like other words; for the good of those who have to master them, it may be that they have been treated too much like beings from another world.

CHARLES HERBERT THURBER.

Cornell University.

A NOTE ON THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH DRAMA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I notice that M. Petit de Julleville in his excellent book 'le Théâtre en France,' p. 305, repeats an error often made (see 'la France littéraire,' Grimm's 'Correspon-

dance,' in footnote) in stating that Saurin's "Beverley" is an imitation of Lillo's "George Barnwell." This is calculated to mislead students of the English and French drama alike. As a matter of fact Saurin's play is modelled on Edward Moore's "Gamester" and Saurin merely followed in the steps of Diderot. The latter had, in 1760, introduced "The Gamester" into France in "le Joueur," which remained in manuscript, but which Saurin undoubtedly knew (see the Garnier edition of Diderot, vol vii, pp. 413-415). Moore had also been translated in 1762 by Bruté de Loirelle. But Lillo's drama had considerable success in France, though not in the instance cited by M. Petit de Julleville. It was translated not far from 1750, (there appears to be an edition of 1748), Diderot had compared it favorably with "the Gamester" and Dorat had put its prison scene into French verse, changing *Barnwell* into *Barnevelt*. Accordingly we are not surprised to find that Mercier, influenced by the success of "Beverley" in 1768, should take up the other play recommended by Diderot, and adapt Lillo to French taste in his first published drama, "Jenneval ou le Barnevelt français" dated 1769 (the dates given for Mercier's works in footnote of p. 323 of 'le Théâtre en France' apply, it will be noticed, to their first performances in Paris). The views of Mercier, who passes for a stern realist, regarding the necessity of toning down his English original to suit the refinement of France, are decidedly amusing (see Preface to the Amsterdam edition (1776) of his works). If not presuming, I would from these and other facts, place the date of French interest in the English stage at least a decade earlier than does M. Petit de Julleville (op. cit. p. 305), and point out that it was evidently Diderot who particularly fostered it among the play wrights, so far as the *drame* was concerned. Shakespeare appears to have appealed to a class entirely different from Diderot and his school.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

THE PHONETIC SECTION

OF THE

Modern Language Association of America.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Although I have already sent invita-

tions to various persons who have shown an interest in phonetics, I should like to publish in the NOTES a general announcement to the effect that any person who is so inclined may become a member of the Section, for 1892, on payment of one dollar to the Secretary. More money is needed to cover the expenses of this year's work, which will consist, in part, of an investigation of the *o-o* and the *a-æ* series ('loss,' 'cost,' etc. and 'pass,' 'ask,' etc.)

I take this opportunity to add 'whom' to my list of *û-u* words, printed in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vi, 8, pp. 464-6. The pronunciation *hum* (*u* as in 'pull'), due, no doubt, to the analogy of 'broom' and 'room,' I have heard recently from several Boston school-teachers; it occurs even when the word is strongly accented; as in, "Don't say *who*, say *whom*" (*dount sei hû, sei hum*). I should be glad to know whether it has been noted elsewhere. 'Whom,' of course, does not belong to the vulgar dialect at all, and therefore affords an interesting example of the influence of popular on learned words.

C. H. GRANDGENT,

Secretary.

Cambridge, Mass.

THE PLAY OF THE WEAVERS OF COVENTRY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Permit me to call attention to a fact, not hitherto noticed I think. The Weaver's play is, "The Presentation in the Temple and the Disputation with the Doctors." The "Presentation" serves as an introduction, the "Disputation" is the heart of the play. The "Disputation" of the Weaver's play is the second scene of the York play of "Christ with the Doctors in the Temple," with a new introduction and a different close.

From the point where Jesus enters and salutes the Doctors, the plays are the same until, in York, Joseph addresses Jesus, and, in Coventry, the Doctor addresses Mary,—sixteen stanzas of the York play. The York play is evidently the older. The Coventry gild, probably, adopted the play with very few alterations, but Robert Croo, in the sixteenth century, changed the wording and occasionally a sentence to suit his own ideas of polished diction. To this he testifies with all the pride

of a literary workman, "Tys matter newly translate be Robert Croo," who, by the way, was a sad bungler at his trade.

CHAS. DAVIDSON.

Belmont School, California.

A NOTE ON THE SOUL AND BODY LEGEND.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—A curious version of the address of the soul to the body, which I believe has not been noted, is found in Wulfstan's Homilies (ed. Napier) p. 140, l. 19 to p. 141, l. 25.

The soul about to leave the body which is already dead, is deterred by fear of the devils who stand about ready to seize it. Realizing its doom, the soul turns upon the body, the cause of all its woes, and addresses it quite in the tone of the address of the cursed soul to the body in the complete legend,—briefly but with similar, prominent trains of thought. The corpse responds by sweating and turning divers hues. The soul is seized by the devil's and cast into hell under unusually painful circumstances, having to undergo a preliminary swallowing by a fiery dragon.

It will be seen that the setting is entirely different from that of the complete legend. The scene is at the bed-side at the moment of death, and not at the grave after an interval of years. The resemblance lies in the fact that the soul addresses the body directly and in the character of the speech. This, which purports to be the vision of "a certain holy man," is probably an adaptation of the central idea of the legend for a specific, didactic purpose.

Since so much work has been done upon the legend and it is desirable to complete, as far as possible, the already large body of relevant material, it has seemed worth while to call attention to this curious variation of the story.

It is not surprising that the legend should have attracted Heine; and it is interesting to note what an original and characteristic turn he has given to it in his poem "Leib und Seele" (Elster ed., vol. ii, p. 90). The first lines are.

"Die arme Seele spricht zum Leibe;
'Ich lass' nicht ob von dir, ich bleibe
Bei dir—'"

The poem is well translated by James Thompson, and included in the edition of his

'City of Dreadful Night and other Poems,' London, (second ed.) 1888.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

Johns Hopkins University.

CONCERNING "JULIANA."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In the preface to 'The Liffade of St. Juliana' [E.E.T. S., 1872], Rev. Oswald Cockayne says of the saint:

"Her story may be read in the 'Acta Sanctorum,' Feb. 16, and in the Codex Exoniensis She is a fabulous personage."

It is quite generally believed, I think, that Juliana never existed. Perhaps Cockayne found no account of her except those that he has mentioned, and, so far as I know, no original evidence of her existence has been pointed out except that given in the 'Acta Sanctorum.' This testimony, however, is quite strong, for the text of the 'Acta' comes "ex xi veteribus manuscriptis," which differ *inter se* just enough to indicate clearly their independence of each other. Yet the value of these manuscripts depends, of course, upon their date, and that we have, so far as my information extends, only vaguely indicated in the word *veteribus*.

It is interesting, therefore, to find in Beda's 'Martyrologium':

"XIV. Kal. [Martii] Et in Cumis natale S. Julianæ virginis: quæ tempore Maximiani imperatoris primo a suo patre Africano cæsa et graviter cruciata a præfecto Eolesio, quem sponsum habuerat, nuda virgis cæsa et a capillis suspensa, et plumbo soluto a capite perfusa. Huc usque A. et rursum in carcere recepta, ubi palam cum diabolo confluxit, et rursum evocata, rotarum tormenta, flammæ ignium, ollam ferventem superavit, ac decollatione capitis martyrium consummavit. Quæ passa est quidem in Nicomedia sed post paucum tempus Deo disponente in Campaniam translata."

Beda mentions Juliana again in his 'Martyrologium Poeticum':

"Sic Juliana et bisseptenas ornat honore." that is, bisseptenas kalendas Martii.

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

A NEW EXEGESIS OF DANTE: PURGATORIO, xix, 56.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: Some statements made by Prof. Todd

in his Note to my discussion of his Exegesis of *Purgatorio xix, 51*,* call for rectification.

1. I have nowhere in my discussion accused the writer of having departed from the "one interpretation on which most commentators are agreed," as the first statement in his Note would seem to imply. On the contrary, I have tried to prove that his own interpretation did not substantially differ from that generally accepted, while he had arrived at it by a way entirely illegitimate.

2. The author's other statement: "Fortunately it is no longer in vogue to give weight to numbers in such a matter" seems calculated to lead the general reader to believe that I have in my discussion done little or no better than give weight to numbers. As a matter of fact, however, I have resorted to authority and numbers in circumstances perfectly legitimate. The first time was when, to convince the writer that he was wrong in affirming that *Purgatorio xix*, is "one of the most variously interpreted of the intrinsically less important passages of the 'Divina Commedia,'" I used the very same authority and numbers which he himself had quoted in support of his assertion. The second time was when the appeal to authority and numbers could not possibly be helped, I had then to prove that the word *donne* was a substantive, meaning *women, ladies*. What could I do except resort to the authority of the dictionary of the Italian language, and the legion of commentators that had always and invariably taken the word as such a substantive? Should I have settled the question on my own authority? Would the writer have accepted it? Certainly not.

By the way, I must, in connection with the statement under consideration, remark that the writer has mis-quoted me in giving what he calls "only a scattering minority, at that!" in "7+etc.+etc."; he should have given it as only 7, or, at most 7+Scartazzini.

3. By his statement: "The essential issue is: Could Dante have used the phrase *donato di* poetically in the sense of 'gifted with,'" the writer has changed the original terms of the question and thereby removed, unintentionally, I suppose, the basis of my discussion. The question as originally stated by the writer

himself and then taken up by me was like this: Should the word *donne* be explained as the abridged past participle of *donare*? Scholars, and even mere cultivated Italians, know that by restating a question, more especially a question turning upon a word, in terms different from the original ones, the issue may be made to change, and a snare be laid for unsuspecting opponents.

4. The writer's statement, beginning from "The interesting question is" down to the concluding paragraph of his Note, has the appearance of proving something; but, in spite of the quotation it contains, and the authorities it cites, proves nothing. And, curiously enough, it gives no list of "questi casi" nor indeed the principle on which the word *done* has been made to be included in "questi casi." However, it seems hard to admit without convincing evidence, that "a tendency at present manifested," in the dialect of the city of Milan, or say in the several dialects of Northern Italy, can furnish evidence of what Dante is supposed to have done, in accordance with said present tendency, in the Italian language of his 'Commedia,' several centuries ago. Indeed a theory that has to rely on such evidence to maintain itself must be very unstable.

5. The author of the proposed exegesis is right I think, in inferring that Prof. Scott accepts his theory. But Prof. Scott has hardly had an opportunity, I suppose, to declare whether he has read my discussion or not, and what opinion he has formed of it; we might, then, yet hear from him. At all events, I shall, until we do hear, consider him as on the side of the proposed theory.

6. The writer says:

"If Prof. Speranza's contention had reference to Ital. *dare, dato*, the uses of which have more direct analogy with those of Eng. *give, given*, I should readily yield the point; but between Ital. *dono* and *donato* I think I see the easy possibility, at least in poetic usage, of a relation similar to that between Eng. *gift* and *gifted*."

Without needlessly discussing here this statement, I wish to persuade the writer that the circumstances in which he should readily yield the point, actually exist. I know I have endeavored to make it plain in my discussion that the reason why I adopted the verb *give*

* See February number (1892) of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

instead of *gift*, *endow*, as proposed by the writer, was the necessity in which I was placed of choosing a verb which, like *give* for instance, admitted of the same construction as *donare*; namely, *give something to somebody*; while *gift*, *endow*, did not admit of such taxis. At the same time, however, I for the nonce attributed to *give*, exactly the same meaning as is indicated by *donare*. Now, I am not particular about the word *give*; my assumption can be proved with any other verb, provided this verb have, or be, by agreement, assumed to have the same meaning as *donare*, and, what is essential, admit of the same construction.

C. L. SPERANZA.

Columbia College.

'G. T. S.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—May I join an unauthorized voice to the prayer addressed to Messrs. Macmillan & Co., in your January Number? Could they possibly be induced to change that ugly and vulgar 'G.T.S.' mark on their *Golden Treasury Series*, and go back to their old distinguished looking circle design?

If it is not an impertinence, might I suggest that MOD. LANG. NOTES would try to influence American printers to divide *know-ledge* and *acknow-ledge*, and not fail to set the example.

W. F. STOCKLEY.

University of New Brunswick.

BRIEF MENTION.

An Association for Spelling Reform (*Norsk rettskrivnings samlag*) has been formed in Christiania, Norway. The circular of invitation to join the society was issued on the sixth of January, 1892, the eightieth birthday of Mr. Knud Knudsen, the old purist and spelling reformer, in acknowledgment of his services to the cause of language and spelling reform in Norway. It is the purpose of the society to work for the most part in the same manner as the Swedish *Rättstavnings sällskapet*—an organisation established some years ago—by publishing a periodical devoted to the cause of spelling reform and by setting a good practical example in this respect for the literary and scientific productions of the members. Among those who signed the call are authors

such as Björnstjerne Björnson; linguists and phoneticians such as Aug. Western, and teachers such as P. Voss, one of the proprietors and directors of the largest school for higher education in Norway.

Teachers of Italian are often forced to deplore the absence of a 'Reader,' containing judiciously selected extracts or complete stories from representative Modern Italian writers, which might serve as a fit introduction to Italian Literature. Two little volumes before us of the 'Biblioteca Italiana' published by the Librairie Hachette et Cie. (Boston, Carl Schoenhof) will do much to supply this want. They contain 'Novelle di Enrico Castelnovo,' 'Gli amici di collegio' and 'Una medaglia' of 'Edmondo de Amicis,' edited by the Rev. A. C. Clapin, M.A. The most difficult words are translated at the foot of the page, and a glossary at the end is intended to take the place of a bulkier dictionary. While rapid reading is thus assured, it may be a question, whether better results would not be obtained if the student, from the beginning, were forced to rely for his translation on his memory, rather than on the help which the footnotes may give him.

PERSONAL.

Professor T. W. Hunt, of Princeton College, has written a book entitled 'Ethical Teachings in Old English Authors'; it will be published in April by Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls, New York.

Dr. O. F. Emerson has been promoted to an Assistant Professorship in English Philology at Cornell University. Dr. Emerson is a graduate of Iowa College (Grinnell, Iowa); after his graduation, several years of teaching preceded his entrance at Cornell University as Fellow in English (1888-9), where in the following year he was appointed an Instructor in English, the position from which he has now been advanced. Dr. Emerson was graduated as Doctor of Philosophy at Cornell University last June; his dissertation on "The Ithaca Dialect" is published in *Dialect Notes*, Part iii (Boston, 1891).

JOURNAL NOTICES.

VIERTELJAHRSSCHRIFT FÜR LITTERATURGESCHICHTE. VOL. IV, 1.—Jellinek, M., Hoffmannswaldaus Heldenbriefe.—Wilhelm, F., Briefe an Karl Wilhelm Ramler.—Morsch, H., Aus der Vorgeschichte von Goethes Iphigenie.—Seuffert, B., Merope und Elpenor.—Hoffmann, P., Untersuchungen über Goethes Ewigen Juden.—Odling, T., Ein Lied von dem Tod und einem jungen Mann.—Werner, R. M., Aus einem Stammbuch des 17. Jahrhunderts.—Trautmann, K., Faustaufführungen in Basel und Nürnberg.—Winter, F., Ein Gedicht der Neuberin auf die Vermählung Friedrichs des Grossen.—Holthausen, F., Zu Lessings Faust-Vorspiel.—Elias, J., Ein Schreiben Herders an Jean Paul Fr. Richter.—Harnack, O., Beiträge zur Chronologie der Faustparalipomena.—Duentzer, H., Zu Schillers Demetrius.—Kossmann, E., Chamisso's Nasengedichte.—Schuddeköpf, C., Nachträge zu Vierteljahrschrift 1, 40 2, 17 2, 268 3, 178 3, 290 3, 457.—2. Bielschowsky, A., Das Alter der Faustspiele.—Wilhelm, F., Briefe an Karl Wilhelm Ramler, nebst einem Briefe an Lessing (Schluss).—Schmidt, E., Lessingiana.—Stittenberger, H., Untersuchungen über Wielands Komische Erzählungen.—Pnlower, O., Die Schüllerscene im Urfaust.—Schroeder, E., Goethes Faust und das Spiel von Frau Jutten.—Seuffert, B., Die älteste Scene im Faust.—Suphan, B., Zu Schillers Demetrius.—Markgraf, P., Sprachliche Beobachtungen zur Marina.—Bluemner, H., Zu Lessings Laokoon.—3. Fraenkel, L. und Bauer, A., Entlehnungen im ältesten Faustbuch. 1. Das Sprichwörter-Kapitel. 2. Brant und noch einmal Dasypodius.—Wolff, E., Das Buch ohne Titel.—Stittenberger, H., Untersuchungen über Wielands Komische Erzählungen (Fortsetzung).—Mueller, E., Vollmers Nachlese zu Schillers Kalender.—Bohe, L., Neue Beiträge zu H. P. Sturz' Lebensgeschichte.—Elster, E., Zu Heines Biographie.—Holstein, H., Zu Tassos Amynt.—Goetze, E., Zu Goethes Briefen.—Jellinek, M. H., Zu Lessings Anmerkungen über das Epigramm.—Beck, P., Ein Einzeldruck Ch. D. Schubarts.—4. Winter, F., Goethes Antheil am Wandsbecker Boten.—Kettner, G., Schillers Maltheser.—Odling, T., Hermann Kirchners Coriolanus.—Distel, T., Ein Gedicht Ulrich Königs.—Lindner, F., Rostocker Findlinge.—Obser, K., Friedrich Eugen von Württemberg und Klinger.—Fischer, H., Ein Jugendbrief Hölderlins.—Seuffert, B., Gedichte Hölderlins.—Jonas, F., Briefe Max von Schenkendorfs.—Loebner, H., Zu Hans Sachs.—Jacoby, D., Hans Sachsens poetische Sendung.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCHES ALTERTUM UND DEUTSCHE LITTERATUR. VOL. XXXV, NO. 2.—Singer, Salomosagen in Deutschland.—Knochendoerffer, Erinnerungen und Priesterleben I.—Mueh, Unfachlas; Mercurius Hanno.—Schoenbach, Altdeutsche Funde aus Innsbruck.—Schroeder, Belisars Ross.—Larsson, Nochmals Schiff und Regenbogen.—Ammann, Segen und Zaubersprüche aus Hohenfurt.—Zimmer, Ossin und Oscar.—Schenk zu Schwelmsberg, Die Herkunft Fischarts.—Bolte, Dyalogus de Divite et Lazaro.—Schroeder, Frisch.—Kossinna, Die Herkunft der 'herman'.—NO. 3. Jellinek und Kraus, Die Widersprüche im Beowulf.—Knochendoerffer, Erinnerungen

und Priesterleben.—Mueh, Germanische Matronennamen; Nehalennia.—Wustmann, Zum Text der Carmina Burana.—Werner, Altdeutsche Bruchstücke aus polnischen Bibliotheken. 2. i. Wolframs Willehalm. ii. Sachsenspiegel. iii. Predigtbruchstück? iv. Eine md. Evangelienharmonie? v. Predigtbruchstücke.—NO. 4. Mueh, Die Sippe des Arminius; Jupiter Tanarus; Requalivahanus.—Schroeder, Excurs über die gotischen Adjectiva auf -als.—Franck, Zu Bruder Hermanns Jolande.—Grienberger, v., Germanische Götternamen auf rheinischen Inschriften.—Duemmler, Legenden vom heiligen Nicolaus.—Petschenig, Altdeutsche Glossen aus Laibach.—Schoenbach, Zwei altdeutsche Predigten; Bruchstück aus dem Alexander des Ulrich von Eschenbach.—Schroeder, Heilmath und Überlieferung der Vorauer Stundeklage.—Bolte, Königin Marie von Ungarn und die ihr zugeeigneten Lieder.—Levissohn, Eine obersteirische Fassung des Volksliedes vom Tanhäuser.

BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE UND LITERATUR. VOL. XV, NO. 3.—Bugge, S., E. Sievers, Vokalverkürzung im Altnordischen.—Jellinek, M., Die Monseer Glossen; Zum Flinsburgfragment; Zu Heinrichs von Freiberg Tristan; Zu Ulrichs von Eschenbach Alexandreis; Die dialektischen Verhältnisse des Monacensis; Zur Skelrins.—Lulck, K., Zur ae. und as. Metrik.—van Helten, Grammatisches.—Strelberg, W., Weiteres zur Geschichte der io-Stämme; Zur Geschichte der es-Stämme.—Liden, E., Etymologien.—Brugmann, K., Zur Frage der Entstehung des grammatischen Geschlechts.—Jackel, H., Zur Lexicologie des Altfriesischen; Zur altfriesischen Palmenglosse; Mundigasi.—Fest, S., Gotische Etymologien.—Kauffmann, F., Mythologische Zeugnisse aus römischen Inschriften. 1. Mercurius Magnusanus.—Bachme, O., Zu Iwein 3225.—Sievers, E., Zu Neidhart. Nachtrag.—VOL. XVI, NOS. 1-2. Leitzmann, A., Untersuchungen über Berthold von Holle.—Bahder, K. v., Bemerkungen zu Reinhart Fuchs.—Meler, J., Studien zur Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte der Rheinlande.—Jiriczek, O. L. K., Die innere Geschichte des Alphartliedes.—Kauffmann, Fr., Mythologische Zeugnisse aus römischen Inschriften. 2. Mars Thingsus et duae Alaeiagae. 3. Dea Nehalennia.—Sievers, E., Grammatische Miscellen.—Strelberg, W., Slav. -žja- und Germ. -as- im Comparativ.—van Helten, Grammatisches; Frisica; Notiz.—Jellinek, M., Das Suffix -io.—Lulck, K., Unechte und steigende Diphthonge.—Holthausen, F., Requalivahanus.—Leitzmann, A., Berthold von Holle ein Nachahmer Wolframs von Eschenbach.—Sievers, E., Scéaf in nordischen Genealogien; Sinfarfzilo; Die angebliche Götlin Ríen.—Meler, J., Berichtigung.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1892.

THE CYNEWULF QUESTION FROM A METRICAL POINT OF VIEW.

BEFORE presenting the results of my study of the longer poems of the Cynewulf cycle, it may be well to review in brief the course of previous investigation. I shall treat the subject only in its main outlines; for there is a complete bibliography of all but the latest work in Wülker's 'Grundriss.'

In 1840 John Kemble discovered the interpretation of the runic acrostic in "Elene," and advanced the theory that the poet Cynewulf was a West-Saxon bishop by that name, of the late tenth and early eleventh century. Jacob Grimm who made the discovery almost simultaneously in Germany, suggested that the poet might be a Northumbrian of the eighth century and a pupil of Aldhelm. Thus the question of the original dialect of the poems was raised at the outset. Kemble's position proved untenable; the language of the poems, even if not originally Northumbrian, preserves forms much older than the tenth century.

The same name was found in the poems of "Elene" and of "Crist" in the Exeter book; this brought the number of signed poems to three.

The question arose how many of the other poems of the Exeter and Vercelli codices were to be assigned to the same author. There was a general tendency, as there is to-day, to attribute the greater part of these poems to Cynewulf, on the basis of general similarities of style.

Dietrich (*Z. f. D. A.* ix, 193 f.) proved that the "Crist" was not a collection of loosely connected hymns as printed by Thorpe, but a complete poem in three parts upon the Advent (ll. 1-439), Ascension (ll. 440-778), and Second Coming of Christ (ll. 779-1694).

In 1857 Leo suggested that the solution of the first riddle of the Exeter book was the name Cynewulf, in the Northumbrian form *Cwēne*- or *Ccēnewulf*, thus adding the "Riddles" to the three signed poems.

Dietrich in 1859, after the deciphering of the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross, attributed

the "Dream of the Rood" of the Vercelli book to Cynewulf, and acknowledged himself converted to the Northumbrian theory. The "Leyden Riddle," an old Northumbrian version of one of the riddles of the Exeter book, seemed to give additional evidence for the Northumbrian theory. In 1865 Dietrich pressed the identification with the Bishop of Lindesfarne (*782) which had been wrongly attributed to Grimm by Kemble. This identification, although not chronologically impossible, is given up; and no more probable one has been suggested.

ten Brink in his 'History of English Literature' vol. i (1877), embodied the results of this first period of investigation conservatively in the body of his work and extravagantly in the famous "Cynewulf Romance" in the Appendix. This work closes the first period of Cynewulf criticism. The state of the question was:

1. The "Riddles" (1-60) had been added to the surely Cynewulfian poems.
2. There was a general tendency to include most of the poems of the Exeter and Vercelli codices.
3. Cynewulf's date was set near or after the middle of the eighth century.
4. The Northumbrian theory had gained ground.
5. All early identifications of Cynewulf were abandoned.

Beginning with 1878 we find a number of "stylistische Untersuchungen" of the separate poems. The method was the comparison of epithets and half-lines of the poems examined with similar epithets and half-lines in the poems known or assumed to be by Cynewulf. With two exceptions, all these investigations tended to prove that any poem examined showed such striking similarities in style to the Cynewulfian poems that it must be by the same author.

The exceptions were two papers in the second volume of *Anglia*. One by Charitius confirmed the division of the "Guthlac" poem after l. 790, and denied the first part, or A (1-790) to Cynewulf. The other by Fritsche, proved that "Andreas" showed considerable differences in vocabulary from the Cynewulfian poems, and stood nearer to "Beowulf" than

to them. These are, perhaps, the only results based on the stylistic criticism which are likely to stand.

Without delaying over the details of this stylistic criticism I shall proceed to Sarrazin's 'Beowulf-Studien' (1888), in which he has carried the stylistic method to its farthest point. According to Sarrazin, not only is practically all the poetry of the Exeter and Vercelli codices by Cynewulf, but also "Beowulf." That is considerably over three quarters of all the Anglo-Saxon poetry extant. Kail (*Anglia* xii, p. 21) has shown the absurdity of Sarrazin's method by applying it successfully to poems, which chronologically cannot possibly be by Cynewulf. And McClumpha and Merrill (*MOD. LANG. NOTES*. vol. v, p. 164), in their concordance of the parallelisms of the "Genesis" have shown, by implication, that following Sarrazin's method there is no good reason for excluding the Cædmon poems from the Cynewulfian canon.

All this sort of investigation has proved little more than what might have been learned without so much pains: that the Anglo-Saxon epithet, imagery, and style are essentially formal and conventional throughout the whole body of the poetry, and that it is, in the main, impossible to settle questions of authorship from similarities of style in Anglo-Saxon poetry.

Napier (*Z.f.D.A.* xxxiii, p. 70 f.) published a new acrostic signature which he discovered in the Vercelli book, on the page immediately following the "Fata Apostolorum." This he regarded as the epilogue of the "Fata Apostolorum," and it seemed certain that a fourth must be added to the three poems signed by Cynewulf.

About five years ago the long disputed question of the Anglo-Saxon alliterative versification was cleared up by Sievers (*Beiträge*, vol. x). This gave a new start to textual criticism, and by showing that metrical faults in the West-Saxon versions could be amended by the substitution of Anglian forms, supplied much new evidence for the Northumbrian origin of the poems.

The state of the question at the end of this second period of criticism may be summed up as follows:

1. A new signature of Cynewulf had been

found, and apparently a new poem, the "Fata Apostolorum," added with certainty to his works.

2. Since nearly every chronologically available poem had been attributed to Cynewulf, there was a very general scepticism with regard to the unsigned poems. In all probability a great majority would have agreed in attributing the "Phœnix" and "Guthlac B" to Cynewulf; many rejected "Andreas;" and a respectable minority doubted the Cynewulfian authorship of the "Riddles," on the basis of Trautmann's article in *Anglia Anz.* vi, p. 158, wherein he offers a new solution for the first riddle.

3. The Northumbrian theory still gained ground, largely because of Siever's metrical emendations by the substitution of Anglian forms; also by the finding of many traces of the Anglian phonology in the West-Saxon versions.

Since Siever's articles, the first and, so far as I know, the only serious attempt, to apply metrical criteria to the solution of this question is that of Cremer.¹ He denies "Guthlac A" and the "Phœnix" to Cynewulf on metrical grounds, and "Crist A" and "Andreas," chiefly for linguistic reasons. He also attributes "Guthlac B" to Cynewulf with certainty. Later I shall consider this important dissertation somewhat in detail before presenting my own work on similar lines.

Siever's article (*Anglia*, vol. xiii, 1-25) has done much to bring the question within more manageable limits. He shows first, that the Vercelli signature discovered by Napier is probably not the epilogue of the "Fata Apostolorum," but is rather a cancelled fragment copied or inserted into the MS. by mistake. It is the epilogue of some lost poem by Cynewulf.

The spelling Cynewulf with a medial, unaccented e, preserved in "Elene" and in "Juliana" proves that the signature was written after the substitution of e for i in unaccented syllables, that is, about or after 750 A.D. Since the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross and the "Leyden Riddle" show unac-

¹ Matthias Cremer: 'Metrische und Sprachliche Untersuchung der altenglischen Gedichte Andreas, Gûþlâc, Phœnix, (Elene, Juliana, Crist). Ein Beitrag zur Cynewulffrage.' Bonn, 1888.

cented *i* for later *e*, they are too early to be by Cynewulf. Riddle xxiv shows *agof* (*boga* reversed). When it was written, *b* for Germ. *þ* final must have been possible. That is, the riddle must have been written considerably before the middle of the eighth century. Other evidence is adduced to show that the riddles as a whole are too early to be by Cynewulf.

With the results of these two investigations in mind, we may state the present condition of the subject.

1. Some of the poems that have long passed for his are certainly not by Cynewulf. And a strong presumption is established against any poem not actually signed by runes.

2. The Northumbrian theory is deprived of an important argument, through the denying to Cynewulf of the Northumbrian versions of the "Ruthwell Cross" and the "Leyden Riddle." The many supporters of it must fall back on what has all along been their surest ground: the Anglian peculiarities found in the poems, and the even stronger historical argument, that during the period of these poems Northumbria was a centre of intellectual life where such poems were likely to originate, while Wessex was still politically and intellectually undeveloped.

I had practically finished a complete metrical comparison of the poems of the Cynewulf cycle in ignorance of Cremer's dissertation. My independent work lead me to the belief that "Guthlac A" and the "Phoenix" could not be by Cynewulf; but I was not prepared to attribute "Guthlac B" to that poet with the same confidence as Cremer. My only important difference from him was that I saw no reason for doubting that the whole of the "Crist" was by Cynewulf. It seemed worth while to present my work, first, because few in this country have learned the results of Cremer's dissertation. In fact, even in Germany the work has been overlooked in some unaccountable way. Possibly owing to a general ignorance of or scepticism about Anglo-Saxon metrics. Then I felt that by confirming Cremer's results in certain cases and by revising them in minor points, it might be possible to arrive at something like a final statement of results, and carry the problem well towards a solution. The important thing,

after all, is to show that metrical criteria may be applied successfully to questions of authorship in Anglo-Saxon poetry.

Cremer conducts his metrical comparison under six heads (p. 31) which I shall consider separately.

1. Comparison of the types in the first and second half-lines respectively of the different poems. This is the most obvious method of comparison and the one that on the whole gives the most results.

2. Comparison of the similar types in the first and second half-lines (difference). This is an attempt to compare the ratios existing in the different poems, between similar types in the first and second half-lines. It will be seen that such ratios will generally be brought out and are already implied in comparison. Cremer's method of expressing such ratios is a singular instance of the misuse of statistics. From his percentages of a thousand, he finds an expression for the difference between the types in the first and second half-lines, and then compares these differences instead of the ratios, thus:

"Juliana," A type +94 (94 more in first than in second half-line).

"Crist A," A type -44 (44 less in first than in second half-line).

+94 : -44 is an alarming ratio against the first part of the "Crist"; but the ratios and the facts are the following:

"Juliana" 474 first half to 380, second half= about 24- : 19.

"Crist A," 388 first half to 432, second half= about 19 : 22-.

The difference is comparatively insignificant; and a ratio of +94 : -44 is wholly misleading as to the facts of the case. Cremer's table of differences is worth no more than its + and - signs.

3. Comparisons of the subvarieties of types. This is an interesting comparison but it brings out little or nothing not already included in the first comparison, or in the fifth (double alliteration). It keeps the comparison clearer to consider that a type represents essentially the same movement whether in its simpler or rarer extended forms.

4. Comparison of the hypermetric lines (Schwellverse) cf. Bright's 'Anglo-Saxon Read-

er,' Appendix ii. The usage within the Cynewulfian poems varies so much that the comparison offers no test of authorship, though possibly an indication as to chronology.

5. Use of double alliteration in the first half-line. One of the most important tests. Since with only two exceptions the poems show a remarkable similarity in its use, it is quite as effective and more expeditious to compare the total occurrences of double alliteration in the separate poems, rather than with Cremer to carry the comparison through type by type.

6. Combinations of the types to form the long line. He divides the five types into two classes (1) with descending (*fallender*) rhythm or movement (A—D, E), (2) with ascending (*steigender*) rhythm (B, C), and finds the ratio of the ascending and the descending types which are used to complete a line beginning with a given type. The Cynewulfian poems show such divergence in this matter, that we cannot obtain criteria from them. Thus completing:

Type A (1) $a^2 x|-x$ "Elene" has 100 descending, 356 ascending.

"Juliana" has 100 descending, 544 ascending.

"Crist B" " 100 " 284 "

"Guth. A" " 100 " 660 "

Evidently we cannot exclude "Gutlac A," which while it is farthest removed from the Cynewulfian poems, does not differ as much from "Juliana" as "Juliana" does from "Crist B," unless we make the gratuitous assumption that in the three signed poems we have the limits of Cynewulf's style.

The weakness of Cremer's paper is that he has made this assumption, and in a mistaken desire for cumulative evidence, has drawn in many wholly unimportant facts. Cremer's results would be more convincing if disencumbered of half the arguments for them.

From my independent work and a careful consideration of Cremer's dissertation, I have come to the conclusion that there are, for this problem, two fruitful methods of comparison which include the more extended and intricate comparisons of Cremer.

1. Comparison of the similar types in the different poems.

2. a = alliterative letter.

2. Comparison of the proportion of double to single alliteration in the first half-line of the different poems.

In addition, it will be well to note the occurrences of hypermetric lines in the different poems.

Cremer's comparison is wholly mechanical; he does not attempt to state the real significance of the metrical variations he observes. I shall try to justify my metrical criteria, and show that the differences revealed by the comparison are real differences. This should be done in every metrical investigation; for it is possible to perform such curious and inconsequential arithmetic upon any two given pieces of text, that they shall appear to be by different authors. Metrics and æsthetics must go hand in hand in any such investigation. Accordingly, I shall try to state the effect of greater or smaller numbers of the types in a poem.

The types may be divided roughly into two classes. The first including A and B may be called for our purposes, in the main, indifferent. That is the verse scheme, excepting rare, extended subvarieties, is possible in any language; seven-eighths of such half-lines, are made up of dactyls and trochees for the A $-x(x)|-x$, and of anapests and iambs for the B $(x)x-|(x)-$. These half-lines are no more irregular than the *knittel vers* in German, or the four stressed metre of the Miracle plays in English.

The second class includes C, especially $x-|x-x$, D and E. This we may call specifically Anglo-Saxon, or possibly West-Germanic. The forms are those that could not exist except in alliterative verse or in verse strongly influenced by it. These types require either compound words or words whose stem-forming syllable receives a strong secondary accent. The epic compound in Anglo-Saxon finds its natural place in these types. The presence or absence of these types in a poem determines very largely its specifically epic character, so far as use of figures goes, or the contrary. Without insisting that the number of D and E types is an absolute arithmetical expression of the epic coloring of a poem, the general principle remains true, that a small number of these types indicates a relatively

smaller use of those epic and metaphorical compounds which are most characteristic of Anglo-Saxon poetic style. This statement is confirmed by the fact that "Beowulf," admittedly the model for Anglo-Saxon epic verse, has about one and three quarter times as many of the D and E types in the second half-line as any other poem I have examined.

From the point of view of verse mechanics the D and E types are to be separated from the other three as slow or heavy types. When there is a small number of them the verse is more facile and lyric, as in the "Phoenix." Compare these lines from "Beowulf":

54^a *lōf lēodcýning* D. 55^a *folcum gefræge* A.
93^a *wlite-beorhtne wang* E. 122^b *and on ræste genam* B.

24^b *lof-dædum sceal* E. 23^b *ponne wig cume* C.

It will be felt that the movement of the D and E types is heavier and slower than that of the other three, though the latter in every case have the greater number of syllables. This halting effect is due, of course, to the frequent juxtaposition of two main stresses in D and to the strong secondary accent in both. I do not mean to say that there are not occasional light D and E types as there are heavy A types, but in general the former are slow or heavy types and have a great part in giving to Anglo-Saxon verse its ponderous movement. The impossibility of reproducing many of them is what makes the modern English alliterative line inadequate to represent the movement of Anglo-Saxon verse.

The D and E types, first as bearers of the epic compound, and second as tending to give a heavy movement to the verse, are most important in my comparison of the poems.

A second and perfectly obvious criterion is the relative frequency of double alliteration in the first half-line. This hardly requires detailed proof. The effect of greater use of double alliteration is first to enrich and adorn the verse, and second to strengthen the first half-line metrically and emphasize it as against the second half-line. The effect of this larger use of alliteration may be compared roughly to the effect of frequent interior rime in the long line of the ballad metre.

The method of comparison is as follows. The three signed poems, "Juliana," "Elene,"

and "Christ B" (the part containing the runic signature), are the centre (the Vercelli fragment is so short that it is not available for our purpose). Only those divergencies are valid for criteria of authorship, which are considerably greater than the differences shown in the same case among the Cynewulfian poems. The practical working of this is that in general only differences of $\frac{1}{4}$ or over are observed. The D and E types will be counted together, for reasons already explained and for the additional reason that they are so nearly related metrically. One scheme falls into the other by the mere transposition of the feet: D, $\text{—}|\text{—}|\text{—}|\text{—}$ x E, $\text{—}|\text{—}|\text{—}|\text{—}$ Then too the sum D+E remains about the same for Cynewulf, though the ratio changes. The method is that of exclusion. I do not hope to set up fast limits and unfailing criteria for Cynewulf's metrical style. The work will show that certain poems cannot be by Cynewulf. On the positive side nothing more can be shown than that a poem may be by Cynewulf. Fortunately the number of such doubtful poems is small; and the work covers the ground, on the whole, satisfactorily.

The investigation has included those poems which being within the cycle are sufficiently long to admit of the application of metrical tests, based on a sufficiently large number of instances. This excludes the shorter poems especially those which have been divided as the "Sea-farer." Accordingly the work has covered, beside the three signed poems, the remaining two parts of the "Crist," "Guthlac A," "Guthlac B," the "Phoenix" and "Andreas." I have added the figures from "Beowulf," taken from Sievers (*Beiträge*, vol. x) for the purpose of comparison.

The figures for "Elene" and "Andreas" in the table are taken from Cremer's dissertation.³ I had scanned five hundred lines of each, enough for a fairly accurate comparison,

³ I have noticed only two mistakes in Cremer's table (p. 34). "Guth B" first half D. 151 (102) should of course be 181 (102), probably a misprint. "Crist A" first half B and D the figures B (140) and D (154) are certainly wrong. The mistake is unaccountable unless in transcribing he has transposed these figures mechanically as seems probable. My own scansion gives B (151), D (134). Of course this mistake makes the percentages wrong and the whole of the figures for "Crist A" untrustworthy. Excepting these mechanical mistakes, my scansion agrees with his very closely. Surprisingly so, considering the intricacy of the metrical system.

before learning of his work. I am glad to relieve myself of further mechanical work by accepting his figures which are undoubtedly correct enough. All the other figures are from my own scansion. The figures in parentheses denote actual occurrence, those to the left the reduction to terms of a thousand, for purposes of comparison. It has seemed best

to present all the figures in one table; including double alliteration, occurrence of types, and hypermetric lines. Numbers which are important for the comparison are printed in heavy-faced type. The three signed poems are marked off from the rest by heavy perpendicular lines.

	BEO.	JUL.	ELENE	CR. III.	CR. II.	CR. I.	GUTH. A	GUTH. B	PHŒN.	ANDR.
First half-line.	Double Alliteration. 497(1535)	437(319)	435(512)	438(401)	482(163)	485(211)	558(419)	479(272)	611(413)	532(915)
A	551(1701)	472(345)	426(562)	424(388)	377(128)	429(187)	573(451)	414(233)	486(329)	433(748)
B	94(293)	141(103)	153(202)	178(160)	200(68)	190(83)	81(64)	160(90)	167(111)	131(225)
C	162(501)	197(144)	193(255)	147(135)	221(75)	163(71)	183(144)	160(90)	142(96)	202(348)
D	147(454)	150(110)	160(211)	136(125)	153(52)	188(82)	86(68)	179(101)	158(107)	176(306)
E	40(126)	39(28)	56(71)	76(70)	44(15)	27(12)	38(30)	65(37)	47(32)	45(74)
Second half-line.	Hypermetric Lines. 4(12)	—	13(71)	40(37)	3(1)	—	38(30)	19(11)	3(2)	6(10)
A	362(1118)	383(280)	357(471)	427(390)	448(152)	423(184)	391(307)	341(195)	449(304)	415(736)
B	233(721)	298(218)	305(403)	243(223)	256(87)	319(139)	262(207)	319(183)	285(194)	216(373)
C	182(564)	201(149)	196(259)	163(150)	168(57)	156(68)	250(197)	164(94)	183(124)	198(340)
D	110(342)	54(40)	76(101)	51(47)	56(19)	64(28)	32(25)	76(43)	37(25)	96(166)
E	108(334)	58(43)	46(61)	74(68)	67(23)	36(16)	29(21)	82(46)	41(28)	53(92)

"BEOWULF" AND THE REMAINING POEMS.

1. "Beowulf," in the first half-line shows a much smaller use of the B type than any other poem except "Guthlac A": $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$.

2. Second half-line. The sum of D and E is from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 times larger than in any other poem. The significance of this in regard to epic style has been already pointed out.

THE SIGNED POEMS "JULIANA," "ELENE," "CRIST III."

1. First half-line. C, "Crist iii." shows only about $\frac{3}{4}$ as many as the other two. 147 to 193, 197.

2. Second half-line B, "Crist iii." has only about $\frac{4}{5}$ as many as the others 243 to 305, 298.

3. C, "Crist iii." has a little more than $\frac{4}{5}$ the numbers for the others 163 to 196, 201.

All the differences except the first are comparatively slight; and the sum of the D and E types is about the same for all the poems. We should not expect a poet to repeat himself exactly in the use of metre; and the existing differences are, in addition, due to difference of time of composition. Sievers (*Beiträge*, vol. xii, 455) has pointed out that on the basis of the use of hypermetric lines the Cynewul-

fian poems fall into three classes; "Juliana" has none, "Elene" 17, and "Crist iii." 37. This undoubtedly points to different periods of composition. Probably, though by no means certainly, the poems containing a considerable number of hypermetric lines are later.

GUTHLAC A AND CYNEWULF.

First half-line. 1. Double alliteration is $\frac{1}{4}$ more frequent 558 to 438.

2. A. is over $\frac{1}{5}$ greater than the largest number shown for Cynewulf and $\frac{1}{2}$ greater than the smallest number. 573 to 472 "Juliana," 424 "Crist iii." No poem but "Beowulf" approaches this figure.

3. B is only $\frac{2}{3}$ the smallest number shown for Cynewulf and less than half the largest number. 81 to 141 "Juliana," 178 "Crist iii."

4. The sum of D and E is only $\frac{2}{3}$ the smallest number shown for Cynewulf. 124 to 189 "Juliana."

5. Second half-line. C is $\frac{1}{4}$ greater than the largest number for Cynewulf and $\frac{1}{2}$ greater than the smallest 250 to 201 "Juliana," 163 "Crist iii."

6. The sum of D and E is only a little over half the smallest number for Cynewulf 61 to 112 "Juliana."

It is plain, I think, that with Charitius "Guthlac A" must be excluded from the Cynewulfian poems, the stylistic critics Lefèvre (*Anglia* vol. vi) and Sarrazin to the contrary.

It is possibly earlier than Cynewulf; for the poet appeals to his audience as contemporaries of the events described. Now these events, in part historical, took place from 698 to 714. Cynewulf wrote after 750. It is not probable, though perhaps possible, that half a century after the acts described the poet should speak as follows:

724. *Hwæt! wē þissa wundra gewitan sindon
eall þās geðodon in ussera
tīda tīman.*

ussera tīda tīman can hardly point back more than one generation. Compare the statement in "Guthlac B."

850. *ūs secgað bēc,
hū Gūðlāc wearð þurh Godes willan
ēadig on Engle.*

Æsthetically the first part of the "Guthlac" has been judged inferior to the second. The metrical differences will show that they cannot be by the same author.

"GUTHLAC B" AND CYNEWULF.

There is only one difference of any note. Second half-line. The sum D and E is $\frac{1}{4}$ greater than the largest number for Cynewulf, and over $\frac{1}{3}$ greater than the smallest number, 158 to 125 "Crist iii." 112 "Juliana."

There is not sufficient ground for excluding "Guthlac B" from the Cynewulfian poems. On the other hand, there is nothing that amounts to convincing proof of its Cynewulfian authorship. Perhaps no Anglo-Saxon poem has been so carefully sifted for style and language, with reference to the Cynewulf question. All four of those who have gone through with it, Charitius, Lefèvre, Sarrazin and Cremer, unite in attributing it to Cynewulf; and it is noticeable that so thorough a sifting has brought to light no such linguistic difference from Cynewulf as have been shown, for instance, in the "Phoenix" and in "Andreas." In view of the absence of evidence against it, I am inclined to attribute the poem provisionally, and with little certainty to Cynewulf. It is a tempting hypothesis, that

the Vercelli fragment may be the epilogue to the unfinished poem "Guthlac B." The compiler of the Vercelli book certainly was interested in the Guthlac legend, for there is in the MS. a fragment of the Anglo-Saxon prose version of the life of that saint. This view is among the possibilities; and though entirely unproved, it has the merit of appeasing that desire of docketing unclassified things, which we all yield to occasionally.

It is quite needless to show in detail the differences between "Guthlac A" and "Guthlac B," as they are implied in the comparison with Cynewulf. A glance at the figures for A, B, D and E in the first half-line, and at C, D and E in the second half-line, shows the great divergencies between the poems. They cannot be by the same author. "Guth. A" is quite unique in the large use of the A type in the first half-line, and in the remarkably small use of the D and E types in both half-lines.

THE PHŒNIX AND CYNEWULF.

There are for our purposes only two noteworthy differences, but they are very significant.

1. Second half-line. The sum of the D and E types is only $\frac{2}{3}$ the smallest number for Cynewulf, and only $\frac{3}{5}$ the greatest number. 78 to 112 "Juliana," 125 "Crist iii."

2. Double alliteration is nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ greater than is the case in Cynewulf, 611 to 438.

This latter difference alone is quite enough to forbid the attributing of the "Phoenix" to Cynewulf. No Anglo-Saxon poem to my knowledge, shows so large a use of double alliteration. The only poems that approach it are "Guthlac A" which is surely not, and "Andreas" which is probably not Cynewulfian.

The elimination of the slow or heavy types in the second half-line makes the movement more facile and swift, and affords an easier transition between the long lines than is usual in Anglo-Saxon poetry; the verse gives a less disjointed effect than is often found. In no other Anglo-Saxon poem is the verse so smooth and almost lyric in its movement. The increase of double alliteration strengthens the first as against the second half-line; for alliteration always means strong stress. In all the poetry the first half-line tends to be stronger and fuller than the

second, in spite of the fact that the second bears the chief alliterating stress; but in the "Phœnix" we find a great exaggeration of the usual condition. The first half-line is strengthened by the increased use of double alliteration while the second is made light by the partial elimination of the D and E types.

Certain linguistic facts, which strengthen the argument have been observed by Sievers and by Cremer (p. 44). The Cynewulfian poems show only the unlauted plural *fēt* to *fōt*, while the "Phœnix" shows the plurals *fōtas* and *tōðas*. Cf. 311^a *fealwe fōtas*. 407^b *tōðas idge(?)*. Also *glæd* is probable metrically short in Cynewulf, cf. "Crist" 1287^b *glæde blissiað*, while in the "Phœnix" *glæd* is long, cf. 92^a *glædum gimme*, 593^a *in þam glādan hām*, also 289^a, 303^a.

Gäbler (*Anglia*, vol. iii) has tried to prove that the "Phœnix" is by Cynewulf. His method is the stylistic one. The paper offers much of interest with regard to the style of the poem and its relations to its source, but with reference to the authorship of the poem its purely negative testimony cannot stand against the positive testimony of the metre.

We need, I think, have no hesitation in denying the "Phœnix" to Cynewulf. The interesting point of this conclusion is, that there must have been contemporary, or nearly so, with Cynewulf, another poet of equal or greater skill than he, the author of the "Phœnix," the most artistic poem in the Anglo-Saxon language.

"ANDREAS" AND THE CYNEWULFIAN POEMS, show few differences in metre.

1. Double alliteration in the first half-line is about $\frac{1}{4}$ more frequent than for Cynewulf; 532 to 438.

2. The sum of the D and E types in the second half-line is $\frac{1}{5}$ greater than the largest number for Cynewulf and $\frac{1}{3}$ greater than the smallest; 149 to 125 "Crist iii," 112 "Juliana."

The metrical comparison is wholly indecisive, but it adds a little to the testimony adduced by Fritsche against the Cynewulfian authorship of that poem. It is interesting to note that as Fritsche's linguistic and stylistic investigations led him to believe that "Andreas" stands in a nearer relation to "Beo-

wulf" than to the Cynewulf cycle; so the differences in metre, too, are in the direction of the use in "Beowulf." After all deductions, on account of Ramhorst's dissertation, have been made from Fritsche's arguments, a considerable weight of evidence rests against the Cynewulfian authorship of "Andreas." We may say that there seems to be no good reason for ascribing the poem to that author.

CRIST I AND II, AND CYNEWULF.

Here I must take up Cremer's argument somewhat in detail. Cremer's division of the poem into two parts at line 778 is purely arbitrary, and is an unwarranted anticipation of the division he wishes to make into Cynewulfian and non-Cynewulfian parts. The triple division by Dietrich (*Z.f.D.A.*, vol. ix, 193) has long been accepted and is still the best. It is borne out both by the content and external features of the poem. Lines 1-489 form a series of rather loosely connected hymns, each introduced by the expletive *Eā lā*. Their subject is the nativity of Christ. At line 489 the series comes to a close and is capped with an "Amen." Lines 490-778 give a more connected account of the ascension. With line 779 the subject changes to the second coming and the last judgment. The runic acrostic near the beginning of the third section divides it from the rest. The third section is marked formally, by the free use of the hypermetric line which is practically wanting in the first two parts, internally, by more poetical diction and greater power. In spite of the disparaging criticism of Thorpe, the treatment of the Day of Judgment compares favorably with anything in Cynewulf.

Dietrich attributes the whole poem to Cynewulf, but at different periods. Sievers (*Beit-räge*, vol. xii, 455) sees that the different use of the hypermetric line points to different periods of authorship; but sees a contradiction to this in the fact that the runic signature is inserted in the body of the poem, instead of near the end according to Cynewulf's use in every other instance. He offers no explanation of the difficulty.

Cremer's interpretation of the placing of the runes at the beginning of "Crist iii." is as follows: supposing the poet to have finished an incomplete poem begun by another,—

(p. 48) "Es hat nur sinn, wenn ein verfasser sich am schlusse oder gleich im anfang seines werkes nennt, den namen aber mitten hinein zu stellen ist beispieillos. Mich dünkt dass Cy. seinen namen zu anfang des dritten theiles gesetzt hat, um dadurch klar und deutlich zu sagen, hier beginnt mein werk, was folgt ist mein eigentum, was vorangeht hat einen anderen dichter zum verfasser."

This is plausible, but there is near to hand a more natural explanation of the position of the runes. In every other instance the runic acrostic is found in a somewhat formal epilogue in which the poet speaks in his own person. The name of the author comes naturally in these subjective passages. Now there is no such epilogue to "Crist." Possibly the author felt that after the glowing description of the joys of paradise, with which the poem closes, any words in his own person would be an impertinent and inartistic intrusion. Be that as it may, the fact that there was no epilogue took away any particular reason for inserting the runes at the end of the poem. They might be inserted either in a subjective passage in the body of the poem, if there were one, or where it might please the caprice or the convenience of the poet to put them. As a matter of fact the poet introduces the first person occasionally before and after the runes in the first part of "Crist iii," though rather incidentally and not at all as in the three epilogues. This may, perhaps, explain the apparent exception which has troubled Sievers and Cremer. Possibly the position of the runes was merely a matter of convenience in "Crist"; but there is hardly any other passage than the one in which they are found, where the author speaks in his own person. In any event the absence of them from the end of the poem is explained satisfactorily by the absence of an epilogue; and their present position cannot be shown to have any significance with reference to the authorship of the parts of the poem.

Having met the first and most formidable of Cremer's arguments, the second may be treated briefly. Cremer notices slight metrical differences between "Crist i. and ii." (A) and Cynewulf, but prefers to rest his case upon a single linguistic difference which I shall examine shortly.

My own comparison of "Crist i. and ii." and Cynewulf follows:

1. First half-line. The figures for double alliteration are slightly larger; less than $\frac{1}{8}$, 485 to 438. The number agrees closely with that for "Guthlac B."

2. "Crist ii." shows only about $\frac{4}{5}$ as many of the A type as in "Juliana," the largest number for Cynewulf, but more than $\frac{9}{10}$ as many as in "Crist iii." and "Elene": 377 to 472 "Juliana," 424 "Crist iii."

3. "Crist ii." has $\frac{1}{8}$ more of the B type than the smallest number, but only $\frac{1}{9}$ more than the largest number. 200 to 141 "Juliana," 178 "Crist iii." "Crist i." 190 differs slightly less.

4. "Crist ii." has $\frac{1}{2}$ more of the C type than the smallest number for Cynewulf but only $\frac{1}{8}$ more than the largest number. 221 to 147 "Crist iii.," 197 "Juliana."

5. The unusually large number of the D type in the first half is compensated for by the small number of the E type, so that the sum remains very near that for Cynewulf 215 "Crist i.," to 212 "Crist iii."

6. In the second half-line "Crist ii." shows $\frac{1}{4}$ more of the A type than the smallest and only $\frac{1}{20}$ more than the largest number for Cynewulf 448 to 357 "Elene," 427 "Crist iii."

These comparisons have been made not because they are of any great importance, but because it seemed desirable to show in detail how little the existing differences could indicate difference of authorship. It will be noted that "Crist i." stands very close to the Cynewulfian poems, and that "Christ ii." never shows differences enough from these poems taken together, to exclude it from the same authorship with them. "Crist ii." shows differences only where the Cynewulfian poems show a tendency to differ among themselves. The differences are referable to the different periods of composition indicated by the varying use of hypermetric lines.

This is partially a work of supererogation; for Cremer, the only one who has questioned the Cynewulfian authorship of the whole "Crist," admits that the metre is indecisive in the matter, and rests his argument upon the following test: in Cynewulf the dative of *hām* is always *hām*, while in "Crist" l. 293, we find a dative *hāme* assured by the metre—lō

heofonhāme. He admits that the regular dative *hām* is found, and assured metrically twice for this isolated instance of *hāme*. Without taking this criterion too seriously, I would merely call attention to the fact that Cremer has himself pointed out two inconsistencies of Cynewulf in the use of declensions only four pages before that in which he bases an argument on one such variation (p. 43); *dæg* has its gp. both after the strong declension *daga*, and the weak declension *dagena*. The acc. of *onȳn* is formed both after the *i* and *a* declensions, "Elene" 349, *onsion mine*, "Crist" 796, *fore onȳne*.⁴ With these facts in view we are hardly prepared, I think, to deny "Crist i. and ii." to Cynewulf because beside the regular form, this portion of the poem contains one dative not found in the Cynewulfian poems. Cynewulf allowed himself some liberty with his genitives and accusatives, why not also with his datives?

The fact that the three divisions of the poem stand in definite relations to each other, in the development of the story, their juxtaposition in the manuscript, and their striking similarity in metre to "Crist iii" and the other Cynewulfian poems, must outweigh a single linguistic difference. There is no good reason for doubting that the three parts of the "Crist" are by Cynewulf.

It may be well in summing up to state the bearing of Sievers' recent investigation, upon the Cynewulf question in general.

With the denial of the "Riddles" to Cynewulf, vanishes all tangible proof of his activity in secular literature, and with it the romantic story of his wandering, gleeman youth and early manhood. If we give full credence to the rhetorical and occasionally obscure epilogue of "Elene," we must admit that he had been a layman and had had experience of courtly life. But this is only to say that he had not been brought up from the first for the church, and does not imply that he had led a secular life for any considerable time. Much of this epilogue does not give the impression of autobiography at all. Many of the details may be wholly typical and general. At all

⁴ Such variations are of course much less radical than that between the unlauded and ununlauded plurals, *fēl*, *fōlas*, noticed between Cynewulf and the "Phoenix."

events till the interpretation of the epilogue is more certain, its biographical value is necessarily slight. If Cynewulf was probably in orders nearly all his life, the identification with the Bishop of Lindesfarne, installed 740 died 783, becomes again possible. The dates of this Bishop are a little early; and the identification can only be tentative and very slightly probable.

The results with regard to the poems examined may be summed up as follows:

The following poems are certainly by Cynewulf, and according to their number of hyper-metric lines they fall into three groups: 1. "Juliana" and "Crist i."; 2. "Crist ii." and "Elene"; 3. "Crist iii." and the Vercelli fragment. I, of course, do not mean to make any assertion as to their chronological order by this grouping. In our present knowledge, or rather lack of knowledge, of the poet and of poetic methods among the Anglo-Saxons, such a chronological ordering must be too largely subjective to be of much value.

There is no strong reason for excluding "Guthlac B" from the Cynewulfian poems; on the other hand the evidence in its favor is not wholly convincing. If it be admitted provisionally, it would fall into the third or "Crist iii." group.

"Guthlac A" is certainly not by Cynewulf and as certainly not by the author of "Guthlac B." Its metrical use appears quite unique.

The "Phoenix" is not Cynewulfian. It is unique in its use of double alliteration.

The metre is not decisive as to the authorship of "Andreas"; but it adds a little to the strong evidence adduced by Fritsche for the non-Cynewulfian authorship of this poem. In style and metre "Andreas" is related rather to the secular epic, "Beowulf," than to the ecclesiastical legend as "Elene."

It were hardly necessary to prove that "Beowulf" is not by Cynewulf; but if there be a lingering believer, except Sarrazin, in Sarrazin's theory, the metrical comparison will show him that the poems stand far apart.

This investigation has embraced every poem of the cycle of sufficient length to warrant the application of metrical tests.

With the statements made above, none of them new, but some, perhaps for the first time

sufficiently established, we may consider the Cynewulf problem to be much nearer than before to a solution.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

Johns Hopkins University.

DIE ETYMOLOGIE VON *pflegen*.

ÜBER die Etymologie des Wortes *pflegen* sind bereits vielfache Hypothesen aufgestellt worden, welche jedoch bisher zu keinem befriedigendem Resultat geführt haben. Die gegenwärtige Abhandlung ist ein Versuch, etwas zur Lösung dieser Frage beizutragen. Schade hält, durch den Anlaut veranlasst, das Wort für ein aus der Fremde eingeführtes und leitet es vom lat. *plicare* ab. Dieselbe Ansicht wird in Grimm's Wörterbuch vertreten. Jedoch lässt sich dagegen geltend machen, dass sich das Wort in sämtlichen germanischen Dialecten findet, dass der Bedeutungsübergang von 'falten' zum Begriff des ahd. Wortes *phlegan* 'verantwortlich sein' einerseits, wie auch zu dem von 'rascher Bewegung, Kampf,' was das ags. *plege* bedeutet, andererseits, aller Vermittelung entbehrt und dass in keiner der romanischen Sprachen das aus lat. *plicare* entstandene Wort in einer auch nur ähnlichen Bedeutung vorkommt. Ferner dürften sich Zweifel erheben lassen gegen die Ursprünglichkeit der schwachen Conjugation, welche, als einem Lehnwort zukommend, noch in Grimm's 'Wörterbuch' behauptet wird, obwohl die frühesten uns erhaltenen Formen im Ahd. der starken Conjugation angehören. Graff ('Ahd. Spr.' iii, 356) denkt an griech. *πράσσω* und fragt, ob das Wort wohl damit zusammenzubringen sei. Der Anlaut stimmt jedoch nicht, denn griech. *π* würde ein got. *f* verlangen.

In dem von Wackernagel vorgeschlagenen *βλέπω, βλέφαρον* würde allerdings der Anlaut passen, aber die Labialen *π, φ* machen Schwierigkeiten, ganz abgesehen davon, dass in Bezug auf den Sinn diese Wörter auch nicht die geringste Beziehung zur germanischen Wortfamilie erkennen lassen.

Endlich sei noch kurz erwähnt der Aufsatz von Scherer über 'pflegen' (*Zschr. f. d. Alt. und Litt.* xxii, 322 ff.). Scherer nimmt für das asl. *plesati* 'taugen' anstatt *s* ein ursprüng-

liches *k* an und kommt so auf die Wurzel *plak*, welche in der german. Wurzel *plag* erhalten und vielleicht identisch mit der dem lat. *placere* zu Grunde liegenden Wurzel wäre. Doch auch hier stossen wir uns an das anlautende *p*, für welches man im got. und nhd. ein *f* erwarten sollte. Scherer meint jedoch, diese Unregelmässigkeit wäre gewiss nur scheinbar, da der Anlaut ursprünglich *sph* gewesen sein würde, welches dann zu *sp* wurde. Dieses anlautende *sp* erkennt er in dem ahd. und mhd. *spulgen* wieder, das unmöglich von *pflegen* zu trennen wäre; für dieses hätte man also die Wurzel *sprak* anzusetzen. Dagegen scheint es mir unmöglich, beide Wörter *pflegen* und *spulgen* zusammenzustellen, bevor nicht die Etymologie von *spulgen* aufgeklärt ist und mich eines besseren belehrt hat. Auch wäre es sicher höchst sonderbar, wenn ursprünglich anlautendes *s* sich weder im slav. noch im lat. erhalten hätte und in den germ. Dialecten nur in einem einzigen Worte aufträte, und noch dazu in dem, mit welchem die jüngste Bedeutung des Wortes *pflegen* verknüpft ist. Gibt man aber das anlautende *sp* nicht zu, so fallen die übrigen Beziehungen, welche Scherer für *pflegen* in Anspruch nimmt, von selbst weg.

Nachdem im Vorstehenden die bisher aufgestellten Theorien kurz besprochen worden sind, soll nun versucht werden, eine andere Lösung, welche den Formen und Bedeutungen des Wortes in den verschiedenen Sprachen Rechnung trägt, zu finden.

Die ahd. Form *phlegan*, wie auch die ags. Formen *plega, plegian* weisen auf eine germ. Wurzel *plag*. Es stellt sich nun zunächst die Frage, ob nicht eine idg. Wurzel bezeugt ist, welche in Bezug auf Form und Bedeutung derselben entspricht. Wir kennen nun in der Tat eine idg. Wurzel *bharg*, auch *bargh*, welche je nach ihrem Ursprung verschiedene Bedeutungen hatte. Für die gegenwärtige Untersuchung scheint die *√ bharg, bar-gh*, 'reissen, brechen,' welche sich von *√ bhar* 'ferire' nebst Suffix *g* oder *gh* ableitet, von Wichtigkeit zu sein. Von *√ bargh* stammen gr. *βραχύς*, lat. *brehvis, brevis*, got. *praggan* 'drängen,' asl. *bržŭ* 'schnell'; von *√ bharg*, lat. *frangere*, got. *brikan*, nhd. *brechen*. (Über den Wechsel zwischen Media und Media aspirata vgl. Brugmann, Grdr. d. vgl. Gr. d. idg.

Spr. i. § 469. 8). Behält man die Grundbedeutung 'reissen' im Auge, so dürfte man vielleicht auch die Ableitung des gr. *βραχίων* und des lat. *brachium* (eigentlich 'das Glied, mit welchem man reisst') von *√ bargh* nicht befremdlich finden, wie ja auch skr. *haraṇam* 'Hand,' *harāmi* 'hasstig ergreifen, raffen,' zd. *zar* 'ergreifen' heisst. Fick (Wb. d. idg. Spr. iv, p. 63) hält beide Wurzeln, *bargh* und *bharg*, mit Recht für identisch, indem er sagt: "*bar-gh*, reissen, brechen, ist, wenn überhaupt richtig angesetzt, vom europ. *bhra-g*, brechen, wohl kaum verschieden. Das ableitende Element wäre dann nicht *gh*, sondern *g*, und das Wort von *bhar* 'ferire,' 'forare,' herzuleiten." Wie got. *praggan*, lässt sich ahd. *plegan*, *phlegan* auf die Wurzel *bargh* zurückführen und entspricht derselben lautgesetzlich genau. Hier wie dort findet sich Metathese des *r*, welches in *plegan* als *l* auftritt. (Über den Wechsel zwischen *r* und *l* vgl. Brugmann a. a. O. § 282), und der Umstand, dass idg. *b* im Anlaut bei der ersten Lautverschiebung eine Ausnahmestellung einnimmt, indem anl. skr. *b*, gr. *β*, lat. *b*, got. *p* sich im Wortschatz der idg. Sprachen nicht entsprechen, kann nicht stören. Denn von dieser Regel, deren Grund offenbar ist, dass die labiale Media im idg. im Anlaut kaum vorkam, giebt es einige wenige Ausnahmen. Zu diesen gehören, ausser *βραχίς* und *βούς*, die schallnachahmenden Wörter (S. Grassmann KZ. xii. 122).

Über *βραχίς* sagt Grassmann (KZ. xvii 269): "Genau sowie in der vorigen Nummer urlat. *lehv-is* zu *ἐλαχύς*, verhält sich urlat. *brehvis*, lat. *brevis* zu gr. *βραχύς*, altsl. *brŭzŭ* 'schnell.' Dass übrigens die den drei Sprachen gemeinsame Urform *braghū* erst aus *mraghū* entstanden sei, wie L. Meyer wegen got. *gamaurg-jan* 'abkürzen' behauptet, ist mir um so unwahrscheinlicher, als sich *braghū brevis* aus skr. *√ barh*, ursprünglich *bargh* 'ausreissen' ungezwungen erklärt, indem es logisch mit lat. *curtus* d. i. eigentlich 'abgerissen' (skr. *√ çar* [çr] *kart*) zusammenfällt."

Grassmann hält das Wort *βραχίς*, wie er sich selbst ausdrückt, für ein kostbares Beispiel eines urspr. *b*, da dieser Anlaut sich im lat., griech. und altsl. findet und das Wort logisch sehr gut zur Wurzel *bargh* passt. Seine Gründe scheinen mir entscheidend und dürften durch gegenwärtige Abhandlung, welche dartun will, dass auch die germ. Sprachen dasselbe Wort miteinander dem griech., lat. und asl. entsprechen-

enden Anlaut besitzen, noch unterstützt werden.

Nachdem gezeigt worden ist, dass der Ableitung der germ. *√ plag* aus idg. *bargh* in Bezug auf die Form keine Schwierigkeit im Wege steht, wird es nun darauf ankommen zu zeigen, dass auch in Bezug auf den Sinn beide Wurzeln sich entsprechen. Die Bedeutung der *√ bargh* ist 'reissen' und aus der soeben angeführten Stelle von Grassmann hat sich ergeben, wie diese Bedeutung sich im lat. und griech. zu der von 'kurz,' im asl. zu der von 'schnell' (ein Übergang, der sehr leicht begreiflich ist) umwandelte. Dass der germ. *√ plag* ursprünglich dieselben Bedeutungen, zunächst 'reissen,' dann der daraus hervorgehende Begriff 'schnell' zu Grunde gelegen hat, wird bewiesen durch das vorher erwähnte got. *praggan* ('drängen,' also ungestüme Bewegung) sowohl, als auch durch ags. *plega*, *plegian*. Die Grundbedeutung dieser Wörter ist 'die schnelle heftige Bewegung, das Schlagen' (Vid. Skeat, Etym. Dict. und Grein, Bibl. d. ags. Poesie, iv. 361). Ich führe nur einige Beispiele an, wie *mid handum plegian*, wo durch das Verbum die rasche Bewegung der Hände ausgedrückt wird, wie auch in: *hornfisc plegode glâd geond gârsecg* (Andr.) die schnelle Bewegung des Fisches zum Ausdruck gebracht wird.

Ferner möchte ich hier, jedoch unter aller Reserve auf die deutschen Wörter: *Pflug*, *pflücken* (ags. *pluccjan*) und ihre etwaige Verwandtschaft zu *pflegen* hinweisen. Es passen diese Wörter sehr gut zu der Grundbedeutung 'reissen.' Dass 'pflücken' und die entsprechenden Wörter der übrigen germ. Dialecte aus den roman. Sprachen stammten und vom it. *piluccare*, prov. *pelugar* abzuleiten wären, wie z. B. Weigand annimmt und Diez für möglich hält, scheint mir ganz unwahrscheinlich. Der Umstand, dass das Wort in verschiedenen germ. Dialecten vorkommt und im ahd. die Lautverschiebung mit durchgemacht hat, während es im ags. und an. mit anl. *p* erscheint, spricht entschieden für germ. Ursprung. Die roman. Wörter, it. *piluccare*, prov. *pelugar*, frz. *éplucher* stammen vom lat. *pilare* 'plündern stehlen,' gebildet mittelst des Suffixes *-uc* (S. Diez, Etym. Wb. p. 247) und bei der Ähnlichkeit des roman. und des

germ. Wortes konnte meiner Ansicht nach in den roman. Sprachen leicht eine Vermischung beider eintreten.

Es erübrigt noch, den Bedeutungswandel des Verbums *pflegen* und der mit ihm verwandten Wörter von der frühesten Bedeutung 'reissen, sich heftig bewegen' an zu erklären. Zunächst ging, bei dem wesentlich kriegerischen Charakter unserer Vorfahren daraus, die Bedeutung 'kämpfen, streiten' hervor, wie ja auch got. *brikan* 'brechen' und 'streiten,' *brakja* 'der Kampf' heisst. Wie oben bemerkt, sind diese Bedeutungen belegt durch die ags. Wörter *plega*, *plegian*. Aus der Bedeutung 'kämpfen' leiten sich nun leicht alle Bedeutungen, welche sich in der Folge mit dem Worte *pflegen* verknüpfen, ab. Bedenkt man, dass im germ. Mittelalter der Krieger, welchem ein Vergehen zur Last gelegt wurde, seine Unschuld mit dem Schwerte zu beweisen, die Sache auszufechten hatte, so musste sich leicht aus dem allgemeinen Begriff 'kämpfen' die Idee entwickeln: 'für eine Sache kämpfen, zu kämpfen haben, für etwas verantwortlich sein.' Diesen Sinn hat das ahd. *phlegan*. Daher sagt Scherer (*Z. f. d. Alt.* xxii. 322):

"Im Heliand, wie bei Otfrid wird an der Stelle, wo Pilatus alle Verantwortlichkeit am Tode Christi ablehnt, das Wort *plegan* gebraucht im Sinne von schuldig sein, die Verantwortung übernehmen, oder wie Heyne es ausdrückt, für die Folgen einer Handlung eintreten. . . . Und so sagt Otfrid auch *Giborganero dato ni pligit man hiar nu drato*, für verborgene Handlungen steht man hier auf Erden nicht zur Verantwortung."

Aber nicht bloss für eine Sache kämpfte man, sondern auch für eine Person, man nahm ihre Stelle ein, wie die Frau vom Manne mit dem Schwerte vertreten wurde. So entwickelte sich die Bedeutung 'für jemand kämpfen' und dann allgemein 'Bürge sein für jemand.' In der Bedeutung 'Bürge' erscheint das mlat. *plegius*, afrz. *pleige* und die verwandten mlat. und roman. Wörter, wie auch das engl. *pledge*. Bei diesem Worte, das natürlich das von den Normannen mit nach England gebrachte *pleige* ist, finde ich einen Beweis dafür, dass der Begriff des 'Kämpfens, Kämpfens für jemand' ursprünglich mit dem Worte verknüpft war und hie und da noch später durchgeföhlt wurde. Ausser der Bedeutung 'verbürg-

en' heisst bekanntlich *to pledge* 'to invite to drink' und ich lese darüber in Jamison, 'Etym. Dict. of the Scottish Language':

"This term is not peculiar to S., but used by Shakespeare and other English writers. I mention it, therefore, merely to take notice of the traditionary account given of its origin. It is said that in this country in times of general distrust in consequence of family feuds or the violence of factions, when a man was about to drink, it was customary for some friend in the company to say: I pledge you; at the same time drawing his dirk and resting the pommel of it on the table at which they sat. The meaning was that he pledged his life for that of his friend, while he was drinking, that no man in company should take advantage of his defenceless situation. Shakespeare would seem to allude to this custom, when he says:

'The fellow that
Parts bread with him in a divided draught,
Is the readiest man to kill him.'

Timon of Athens."

Aus dem palatalen Laut *dg* des Wortes *pledge* geht hervor, dass dasselbe von den Normannen mit über den Canal gebracht worden ist. Es ist also auch anzunehmen, dass die eben angedeutete Sitte unter ihnen, welche den militärischen Adel des Landes bildeten, heimisch war.

War das Wort *pledge* von den Normannen mit nach England gebracht, so weist *play* auf ags. Ursprung: *plega*. Skeat verkennt die Verwandtschaft dieses Wortes mit *pledge*, welche ich weiter unten bei Besprechung des roman. Wortes wahrscheinlich zu machen glaube, einerseits, mit dem deutschen *Pflege*, andererseits. In Bezug auf letzteres sagt er: "E. Miller considers ags. *plega* equivalent to Old Fris. *plega*, custom, germ. *Pflege*, care. But though the form exactly answers, the sense is so widely different, that it is hard to see a connection."

Wenige Worte werden genügen, um die Verbindung herzustellen. Von der Bedeutung der 'heftigen Bewegung' war, wie bereits bemerkt, das ags. *plega* zu der von 'Kampf' übergegangen, woraus sich weiter die Bedeutung 'Waffenspiel' und dann 'Spiel im Allgemeinen' entwickelte. So übersetzt auch Grein (*Bibl. d. ags. Poesie* iv, 361) das Wort durch 'motus alacris, pugna und ludus.' (Vgl. Ausdrücke wie *æsc-plega*, *sweord-plega*, etc.). Andererseits musste der Begriff des deutschen Wortes *pflegen* 'verantwortlich

sein für etwas' leicht in denjenigen 'für etwas zu sorgen haben, für etwas sorgen, für jem. sorgen, jem. pflegen' übergehen und die jüngere Bedeutung 'etwas gewöhnlich tun' ergab sich aus der Verbindung von *pflegen* 'dauernd Sorge tragen für etwas' mit dem Infinitiv. (S. Scherer a. a. O.). Damit ist also die Verschiedenheit der Bedeutung zwischen engl. 'play' und dem deutschen 'pflegen' erklärt. Es sei hier noch bemerkt, dass das norw. *platta* eine ganz ähnliche Bedeutung hat wie die, welche mit dem deutschen *pflegen* verknüpft ist, da es 'helfen, versorgen' heisst. Es stimmt auch lautlich zu dem hier behandelten Worte und geht auf die germ. Wurzel *plag* zurück (-*ht*=*ht*). Dass übrigens 'schnell bewegen' und 'gewohnt sein' auch sonst verwandte Bezeichnung haben, zeigt das deutsche 'im Schwange sein'; ferner norw. *bregda* (an. *bregda* 'schwingen, sich ändern') 'sich ändern'; *brigda* 'verändern'; *brigde*, 'Veränderung, Brauch'; *bragd*, 'Brauch, Benehmen.'

Mit *pflegen* sind nahe verwandt das deutsche 'Pflicht,' das ags. *plōch* und *pliht*. Auch der Sinn dieser Wörter erklärt sich aus dem eben nachgewiesenen Bedeutungswandel des Wortes *pflegen*. Wie man mit demjenigen, für den man verantwortlich ist, für den man einsteht, durch ein gewisses Band, durch eine gewisse Gemeinsamkeit der Interessen verknüpft ist, so bezeichnet auch mhd. *phliht* 'Teilnahme, Gemeinschaftlichkeit, das zu tun haben mit etwas'; ferner drückt es die Art und Weise aus, weil diese Gemeinschaft mit gleichartigen Dingen voraussetzt (S. Benecke und Müller, Mhd. Wb. unter *Phliht*). Im nhd. geht das Wort auf den Begriff der Verantwortlichkeit zurück und bedeutet das, wofür man die Verantwortlichkeit übernommen hat, wozu man verpflichtet ist. Ferner mag hier erwähnt werden das nld. *plechtig*, 'feierlich,' *plechtigheid*, 'Feierlichkeit,' deren Bedeutung sich auf den Begriff des Spieles zurückzuführen scheint oder auch auf den der Gemeinschaftlichkeit; ferner nld. *plecht* 'Pfanddocument, Hypothek,' wo also dieselbe Bedeutung vorliegt wie in den roman. Wörtern und dem engl. *pledge*.

Die ags. Wörter *pleoh* und *pliht* bedeuten

beide 'Gefahr.' (Vid. Ettmüller, Lex. Angl., *plegan*), ein Begriff, welcher aus dem des Kampfes ganz naturgemäss hervorgehen musste.

Es erübrigt noch, die roman. Wörter, prov. und afrz. *plevir*, *plivir*, afz. *pleige*, *plegier* zu besprechen. Auch sie sind vielfach der Gegenstand von Hypothesen gewesen, ohne dass es bisher gelungen wäre, ihre Etymologie in genügender Weise aufzuklären.

Diez, der die Form *plegier* nicht kannte, leitet bekanntlich *plevir* von *praebere* ab, indem er auf den häufigen Wechsel zwischen *l* und *r* verweist—eine Etymologie, welche dem Sinne nach wenig befriedigt. Obwohl in Bezug auf die Bedeutung das lat. *praes praedis* zusagt, so bietet diese Ableitung, wie schon Diez bemerkt, formell Schwierigkeiten, indem dann der *u*-Laut des *praes* (*pleu*, *pliu*), der ein auslautendes *b* oder *v* verlangt, sich nicht erklären liesse.

Schon vor Diez hatte Wachter an das ahd. *phlegan* gedacht, welche Ableitung jedoch Diez verwirft, da *phlegan* 'besorgen, verwalteten' heisse. Es ist jedoch gezeigt worden, dass die Bedeutung 'Bürge sein für jem.,' mit welcher im mlat. und in den roman. Sprachen das Wort auftritt, sich sehr gut mit dem deutschen *phlegan* verbinden lässt. Dasselbe sagt daher dem Sinne nach besser zu als Diez annahm.

Auf die Theorie Wachters ist Bartsch zurückgekommen (*Zsch. f. roman. Phil.* ii. 309). Da ihm besonders der Wechsel zwischen *e* und *i* auffällig erscheint, so geht er von dem analogen Fall aus, welchen das prov. Vb. *gequir*, *giquir* darbietet; er denkt dasselbe aus einem nach Analogie von got. *saihwān* angenommenen got. Verbum *jaihwān* entstanden, während afrz. *jehir* vom ahd. *jehan* abzuleiten wäre. In gleicher Weise nimmt er auch eine got. Form *plaihwān* an, nicht *plivān*, eben wegen der Analogie zu *gequir*, *jehir*=got. *jaihwān*. Dieser Annahme steht jedoch entgegen, wie Mackel (*Die germ. Elem. in d. frz. u. pr. Spr.*, *Französ. Studien* von Körting und Koschwitz, vi) richtig bemerkt, dass einem got. *plaihwān* ein ahd. *phlehen* und nicht *phlegen* entsprechen würde, wie dem got. *saihwān* ein ahd. *sehan* entspricht. Tatsächlich steht das *h* in der von Bartsch angesetzten Form in

Widerspruch zu den Gesetzen der Lautverschiebung. Wenn Bartsch dieselben zu Rate gezogen hätte, so würde er ein got. *plaihwan* in Analogie zu *saihwan* und **jaihwan* überhaupt nicht haben bilden können. In diesen beiden Verben ist nämlich das *h* in der got. Form ganz gerechtfertigt, indem *saihwan* auf die idg. W. *sak* zurückgeht und das *h* von *jehan* in den nnd. Dialecten (alts. *gehan*) auf einen gleichen Laut im got. schliessen lässt. Anders verhält es sich aber mit *phlegan*. Dieses Wort, wie es in den nnd. Dialecten auftritt (ags. *plega*, *plegian*) weist auf eine germ. W. *plag*. In einer got. Form hat also das *h* gar keine Berechtigung. Es erscheint auch die Behauptung von B., der Wechsel von *g* und *h* wäre bekannt und begegne gerade mehrfach bei diesen Verben, wenig stichhaltig; *g* findet sich, nach Verner's Gesetz, an Stelle von *h* lediglich im praet. plur. und p. p. von Verben, deren Wurzel in *h* auslautet (wie *dihan*, *digumēs*, *digan*), also in den Formen, in welchen die Wurzelsilbe ursprünglich unbetont war und ein Übergreifen des *g* auf den Inf. dürfte sich schwer nachweisen lassen.

Mackel erkennt vollständig die Schwierigkeiten, welche ein got. **plaihwan* macht. Gesetzt aber, es existierte ein ahd. *plehan*, von dem man ausgehen könnte, so scheinen ihm drei Möglichkeiten, wie afrz. *plevir* sich erklären liesse: (1) dass *plehan* durch *pleir* zu *plevir* geworden wäre. Aber, fragt er: *jehan*—*jehir*? (2) meint er, es könne das Wort zunächst vom prov. entlehnt und dem afz. übermittelt worden sein, in welchem Falle man unmittelbar das got. *plaihwan* als Etymon annehmen könne. Die Entwicklungsreihe würde dann gewesen sein: *plaihwan*, *plecvir*, *plevir*, zu vergleichen mit *sequere*, *severe*, *sivir*. Jedoch ist es wenig wahrscheinlich, dass das nlat. und afrz. ein Wort, das dem germ. Rechtsleben entstammte, durch Vermittelung des prov. überkommen habe. Es ist viel natürlicher, dass es direct aus den germ. Dialecten herübergenommen wurde und offenbar wird, wenn es möglich ist, das afrz. Wort direct aus dem germ. abzuleiten, diese Theorie die grössere Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich haben; (3) Endlich meint Mackel, dass, wie sich im andd. Formen fänden wie *sāwum*, *sewan* (p. p.) neben *sehan*, man auch an-

nehmen müsste *plawun*, *plewan* neben Inf. *plehan* und dass dieses *w*, das möglicherweise sehr häufig erklingen wäre, seinen Reflex in den roman. Sprachen gefunden haben müsste. Hier scheint mir nun Mackel der Wahrheit näher zu kommen als bei seinen beiden ersten Annahmen, wenn auch die Theorie bei ihm nicht durchgeführt ist.

Im Folgenden soll nun versucht werden, die Etymologie der roman. Wörter auf eine Weise zu erklären, welche mit den Lautgesetzen in Einklang steht. Die Hauptsache ist offenbar, den Wechsel zwischen *g* und *v* zu erklären: prov. afrz. *plevir* neben ahd. *plegan*, afrz. *pleige*, *plegier*, welche letztere Form nach Koch's Anm. zu v. 1244 seines 'Josaphat' belegt ist und die ich selbst belegt gefunden habe, und zwar im Reim, in einer der 'Chansons' des Gillebert de Berneville. *Pleige* ist die ältere Form und *plegier* als eine Ableitung davon anzusehen. Die Form *pleige* weist aber auf ein Grundwort, in welchem ein Guttural (oder cons. *e* oder *i*) durch Position geschützt war, wie in *niveus*, *neige*. Wenn das frz. Wort daher von einem germ. abstammt, so musste dieses letztere zur *-ja* Klasse gehören. Das lat. *brevis* neben gr. *βραχυς* zeigt nun, dass die oben angesetzte Wurzel *bargh* bereits in frühär Zeit sich differencirt hat, indem einerseits der Guttural laut rein erhalten blieb, wie im Griechischen, andererseits eine Labiale hinter sich entwickelte, so dass die Reihe *bargh*—*bragh*—*braghv*—*brav*—anzunehmen ist. Der Form *braghv* würde ein germ. *praghv*- oder *plaghv*- entsprechen. Dieses *gh* musste aber bereits urgerm. ausfallen, wenn eine unbetonte Silbe vorherging (vgl. got. *mavi* aus *magwi* neben *magus* und *magap*, got. *nans* für *nawis* aus *nagwis* u. a. Sievers, PB. Beitr. 5. 149). Da nun in den Substantivstämmen auf *-ja* vielfach die Endsilbe ursprünglich den Ton trug, so darf man diese Betonung auch für eine vorausgesetzte Form *plaghvja*, welche zu *pleghvja* und dann unter dem Einfluss dieses Accents zu *plevja* wurde, annehmen. Aus *plevja* aber ergab sich regelmässig afrz. *pleige*. Dieselbe Form würde auch entstehen aus einem ahd. Etymon, in welchem bereits *-ja* zu *-i* übergegangen wäre: *plevi* gen. *plev-jes*; vgl. got. *vadi*, frz. *gage*. Als eine Ableitung von *plevja* würde sich

darstellen das Verbum *plevjan, aus dem, ebenfalls den Lautgesetzen entsprechend, *plevir* (*plivir*) werden musste.

Diese Hypothese dürfte unterstützt werden durch die mndl. Form *plien* (für *pflegen*), welche der *u*-Klasse angehört, wie die Formen *ploen* (praet. pl.) und *gheploen* (p. p.) zeigen. Schon Grimm sieht in *plien* einen Übertritt in die *u*-Klasse (Gr.³ 1. 295), welcher Ansicht sich Heinzel ('Gesch. der. nfr. Geschäftssprache' p. 63) anschliesst. Auch mir scheint diese Annahme sehr wahrscheinlich und es würde dann die Form *plien* sich auf ein älteres *pliun* gründen, hier aber das *u* ein vocalisirtes *v* darstellen, wie in got. *naus*, wie in got. gen. *maujōs* (von *mavi*), wie in *siuns* statt **siunt* aus *sizwnt*.

HUGO WAITZ.

Weimar.

SHALL AND WILL, AND SHOULD AND WOULD.

THE Nestor of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION, Professor Joynes, has expressed a desire "that the pedagogy of the modern languages" should "hold a larger place than heretofore in the columns of the MOD. LANG. NOTES." I wish to take up the question,—How can the correct use of *shall* and *will*, and *should* and *would* best be taught?

The West, in its treatment of these words, sins constantly and flagrantly against the best usage; as this usage is recorded, for example, in the new 'International Dictionary.' In Wisconsin, certainly, *shall* has nearly disappeared from general use. The large German element in our population may partly account for the fact that *will* and *would* have here become words-of-all-work.

Pupils who have never *felt* the distinctions embodied in the best use of *shall* and *will*, can hardly get all the help that they need from a theoretical deduction of the present usage from the primitive signification of the two words. Professor Wendell expounds the logic of our present idiom very helpfully in his new 'English Composition'; but specific rules, skillfully worded and easy of application, must be furnished, if pupils who are deeply infected with a chronic weakness of *shall*-power are

ever to be set right. The rules which follow are those which I give my own classes. Undoubtedly they can be very much improved; and I shall welcome criticism which seeks to show why and how far these rules are poor teaching, or how they can be made better. Of course I do not aim to cover all the ground included under my title, but simply the most important portions of it.

Professor A. S. Hill's 'Rhetoric' borrows its "admirable statement and illustration of the true distinction between these auxiliaries" "from Sir E. W. Head's little work on 'Shall and Will'"; but, as I have found this part of Prof. Hill's 'Rhetoric' to be the only unteachable thing in the book, I have not made any effort to see the work of the English knight. The best discussion of these auxiliaries that I know of is in Bain's 'Higher English Grammar,' pp. 166 to 175.

The one plain rule which needs first of all and most of all to be kept in mind is this: *Learn to say "I shall," "I should," "we shall," and "we should."* I make the rule short in order that it may be remembered. Most of the mistakes made in using the words that we are discussing consist in saying *will* and *would* when *shall* and *should* are really called for. The rule as given guards the switch where pupils most easily get off the track.

I now give a somewhat full set of rules concerning these troublesome auxiliaries.

SHALL AND WILL.

1. The ordinary future tense, the statement of what we expect that the future will bring, calls for *shall* in the first person, for *will* in the second and third persons. (1, *shall*; 2 and 3, *will*). "I shall go this week." "You will be tired before night." "That plan will hardly do."

This is by far the most important specific rule. A candidate for the U. S. Senatorship from Illinois, in the recent senatorial contest, was reported to have made the absurd remark, "I think that I will not be chosen Senator." It may be, however, that he used "shall" in speaking, and that the Chicago newspaper in which I saw the sentence refused to admit it into its columns in the correct form.

My local paper recently contained the follow-

ing information: "We [the inhabitants of this locality] won't have much more good weather this fall." I had supposed that there was a general desire for fine weather.

2. *Will* in the first person, and *shall* in the second and third persons are used to express a resolution or a promise of *the person speaking*, or willingness on his part. (1, *will*; 2 and 3, *shall*).

"I will attend to it myself; you shall have the goods on Thursday."

3. *Will* is used in all three persons to express a resolution or a promise of *the subject of the verb*, or willingness on his part. In the first person, of course, this rule coincides with the preceding one.

"I am sorry for it, but John will smoke."

"John will do it (=is willing to do it, or will be glad to do it) for you, I know."

4. A direct question follows the form of the answer expected. Say "Shall you go?" if you expect for an answer the simple future, "I shall go" or "I shall not go." Say "Will you go?" if you are expecting the promise, "I will go."

5. *Shall* is also used in all three persons to express the idea that some future event is inevitable. This force of the word is very frequent in the Bible in prophecy. In literature this *shall* often means no more than *is to*. The *shall* of inevitable futurity is not common in ordinary prose.

"Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown."

"He goes forth from the door,
Who shall return no more."

(Longfellow.)

6. An ordinary future condition takes *shall* in all three persons, unless some form of speech without either *shall* or *will* is employed. By an ordinary future condition, I mean a clause in which a possible or probable future act or state is expressed as the condition of some other act or state. The clause in which this other act or state is expressed, the conclusion, I am not considering.

"If I (we, you, he, she, they) shall go, I shall (we shall,—you, he, she, they will) have a pleasant time."

According to this view, "If you I (you, he, they) will, etc.," is a strictly proper form of

speech only when some one of the ideas appropriate to *will* is to be expressed. These ideas are given under 3. Personification or attraction may justify or extenuate many departures from this rule; and unquestionably the rule is not very fully observed. To illustrate what I mean by attraction: if I had just said, "That will hardly do," a friend might answer, under the influence of my use of *will*, "If that will not do, try this."

Biblical or poetical language uses the subjunctive mood here.

"If I (we, you, he, she, they) go, etc."

"Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."

In ordinary speech this condition takes the simple present indicative. We say, "If I go (we, you go,—he, she goes,—they go), etc." Sentences like the following, however, contain a future condition with *shall*, and are not uncommon:

"Whenever (=if at any time) you shall look on this diploma, you will remember this Commencement Day."

7. The Ten Commandments exemplify the use of *shall* to express the authoritative declaration of obligation. The use of *shall* in statutes comes under this general head.

8. A *shall* in indirect speech corresponds to a *shall* in direct speech. The use of *will* in indirect speech is also parallel to its use in direct speech. "He says that he shall write." "He says that James will write."

SHOULD AND WOULD.

1. The most general rule under this head is that *should* corresponds to *shall*, and *would* corresponds to *will*. In other words: whenever there is a question as to which is the correct form, *should* or *would*, change the expression in question into the direct speech or into the more vivid form, notice whether this has *shall* or *will*, and then use *should* to correspond to *shall*, or *would* to correspond to *will*. If John asked James, "Shall you go?" this question becomes, in indirect narration, either "John asks James if he shall go," or "John asked James if he should go."

In the same way, "John said that James would go," or "John says that James will go," was, in direct speech, in the very words that were uttered,—"James will go."

One can determine in this way the use of *should* and *would* even in sentences that cannot in strictness be reduced to a form with *shall* or *will*. Construct a sentence with "*shall*" or "*will*" that resembles as nearly as possible the one with "*should*" or "*would*," and it will settle the case. "I should go if I could" does not mean the same as "I shall go if I can," but the latter sentence can settle for us the question of using *should* or *would* in the former. "I should have gone if I could," corresponds in form to the somewhat similar sentence, "I shall go if I can." "I would have gone if I could" has a corresponding sentence in, "I will go if I can." "Should they not agree to the proposals, what must I do?" corresponds to the more vivid sentence with almost the same meaning, "If they shall not agree to the proposals, what must I do?"

2. *Should* expresses the speaker's idea of what is demanded by duty or the circumstances of the case.

"You should not act so."

"That rope should be stronger."

3. *Would* is often used to express a habit or a custom.

"He would often talk about these things."

4. Less important uses are: (1) *Would that* is frequently used to express a wish.

"Would that he had died before this disgrace befell him."

(2) *Would have*, denoting a desire, is often followed by an infinitive with its subject, expressing the thing desired.

"I would have you think of these things."

A writer or speaker frequently has his choice between two different conceptions, each of which is reasonable and appropriate. One of these conceptions may call for *will* or *would*, the other for *shall* or *should*.

I close with the plain rule with which I began: *Learn to say "I shall," "I should," "we shall," and "we should."*

A. H. TOLMAN.

Ripon College.

A GERMAN POEM OF THE XVI. CENTURY.

Ein Neue liett von Jorge maior
vndt steffen Agricula vnnd
von Ihren guthenn Wercken /

Tit. l. 2, Agricula sic.

I.

Nun woldt ir horenn ein newes gedicht
was Jorge maior hatt aus gericht
mit seinen klugenn sinne /
Er ist ein Doctor hochgeleret,
ist mancher worden ihne.

II.

Die edlenn herrenn zu mansfelt,
die gabenn ihme einn grosses gelt,
ir schefflein soldt er weidenn /
ehr hat vergessenn ehr vnd treu,
ist manchenn worden leyde.

III.

Inn eisleuwenn inn der werde stadt /
Jorge maior eine zeyt gewonet hat /
gottes wort das solt er lereinn,
der geitz ihm gar betrogenn hat,
kann solchs alles verkerenn.

IV.

Doctor martinus der heilige mann,
gar klerlich hat gezeiget ann,
aus heiliger schrift so reine
mit got vns nimandt verschonē kann
dann Jhesu christ alleine.

V.

O neinn o nein spricht maior frey,
vor war solchs ist rechte ketzerey,
luther sol man nicht vertrauenn,
wer habenn wil die seligkeit,
auff gute werk mus mann bauenn.

VI.

Durch werck man wol vnd selig stirbt /
durch werck mann gottes gnade erbirt,
durch werck sindt selig wordē
alle menschenn kindt vonn anbeginn
ein ider in seiner ord.

VII.

Wollenn wir habenn auch die seligkeit,
viel werck mir mussenn haben bereeit
ohne werck wirdt nimandt kommenn
ins himmelreich, glaub mir vorwar,
auch werck bringenn grosseñ fromenn /

VIII.

Vnnd het sich maior recht bedacht /

I, 5, *ihne* mistake for *inne*—III., 1, *eisleuwenn*, Eisleben; 3, between *wort* and *das*, a *solt* is cancelled.—IV, 4, *verschone*: *versohne*?—V, 2, *rechte* sec. man.; pr. man. *gar*; 5, *bauenn* sec. man.; pr. man. *trauenn*.—VI, 2, *erbirt*, erwirbt? 5, *ord* perhaps *orde*.—VII, 2, *bereit* sic.

viel werck het er nicht auff gebracht /
falsch het er fur genomenn /
mir hats ein spinnerin gesagt
besser gar het er gesponnenn.

IX.

Aus werck mann lossen garenn spint
als mann bey allenn spinnerinn findt
Ich lob den edelenn flachs
Jorge maior du nur behalt deinn wergk
mir ist guts flachs gewachssenn.

X.

Ein weises kleidt aus flachsse wirdt
das woll die grossenn herrenn zirdt
aus werck mann macht grobe hembtt,
die tragenn die armenn hutte knecht,
vber Irenn schwartzenn hendenn.

XI.

Das werck hat maior mude gemacht,
zu spinenn hat ers auffs dorff gewracht
zu helber steffenn agrikel
zu spinnē hatt ers genomenn ann,
In garenn hat er sich verwickelt.

XII.

Er spint so manchen lossenn fadenn,
das thuch gewint einenn dunnen bodenn
das werck ist gantz verloreenn,
das klagen die armenn hütte knecht,
die werck leute sindt schir erfrorenn.

XIII.

Ir fromenn herrenn vonn mansfelt,
die perkleute klagen sie haben keinn geldt,
das ist ir grosser schade,
das werck im gar nichts gefelt,
aus flachs wirdt ein besser fadenn.

XIV.

Last abe vom werck ir edelenn hernn,
thut euch zu evhenn schifferrn kerenn.
vnd londt denn armenn leutenn,
das wirdt euch bringenn grosses lob,
viel nutz und grosse leute.

XV.

Er steffen grickel ist ein mann,
der die rechten prillenn machenn kann,
der weis die herrenn zu pinndenn,

VIII, 3, *falsch* perhaps for *flachs*.—XI, 2, *gewracht* sic.
XIV, 5, *leute* by mistake repeated from l. 3; perhaps
freude?

das mann in gantzenn lande kein
klugern denn ihm kann findenn.

XVI.

Was steffen sagt das ist war,
die andern mussenn ligenn gar,
alleinn in muss mann horenn,
es ist bey grossenn herrenn brauch
die lieb der grossenn thorenn.

XVII.

Ade mein jorge zu guter nacht,
das liedt sey dir zu gute gemacht /
vnd deinenn gutenn werckenn,
Singe ich noch mehr in diesenn Jar
so solls dein lyber steffenn merckenn.

Ennde.

These verses are found on the three fly-leaves at the end of a volume labelled 'Adiaphoristische Streitschriften' (Yale Univ. Libr. Cat., No. 34^a 26). All the pamphlets it contains were printed during the years 1552-54. The verses were very likely composed and written down not much later than this.

Georgius Maior, who has given his name to the controversy regarding the necessity and efficiency of good works for justification and salvation, was born in 1502 at Nürnberg and died in 1574 at Wittenberg. Further details may be found in F. Ch. Baur, 'Vorlesungen über christliche Dogmengeschichte,' vol. iii, p. 219 ff. and 225 ff. (Leipzig, 1867) and in I. A. Dörner, 'Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, besonders in Deutschland,' p. 336 ff.

The Stephanus Agricola mentioned in our poem must be the son of Stephanus Agricola who died in 1547. In 1553, he was pastor in the little village of Helbra in the territory of the counts of Mansfelt, as is seen from v. XI, 3 and from the title of one of the pamphlets contained in this volume:

Der Prediger in der herrschafft Mansfelt antwort/
Auff Stephani Agricole Pfarhers
zu Helbra ausgegangene schlussreden
und Schmeschriften/ die nēwe lere
in vnsern kirchen / Das gute
werck zur seligkeit nö-
tigsein / belangende.
Anno 1553

He is called there "ein neophytus/ein iunger

Pfarherr auff eim dorffe / . . . welcher der newen lere zu gefallen / vnd sich dieselbigen zu uerfechten vnderstanden hat."

III, 4, contains perhaps an allusion to the nick-name of 'Geitz' (for 'Ge[-orgius]') Maior, which Flaccus Illyricus uses in his treatise:

Wider den Euange-
listen des heiligen Chorrock's /
D. Geitz Maior.
Math. Flac. Illy.
Basel
Anno 1552.

in which he refers to him twice simply as 'D. Geitz.'

'Evangeliste of the Alb' was an other epithet of Maior; perhaps the 'white garment' in vs. X, 1, alludes to it. Cf. also a passage in

Ein Sermon von S
Pauli vnd aller Gottfürchtigen men-
schen bekerung zu Gott /
Durch

D. Georg: Maior
Hieraus ist kar zu befinden / das Do-
ctori Maiori / von seinen abgünstigen / vn-
billich aufferleget / wie er lehre / das gute werck zum
Vordienst der seligkeit nötig sein / vnd wird hie
angezeigt / ob / wie / welchen / vnd war-
umb gute wercke dennoch zur se-
ligkeit von nöten, etc., etc.

"Zum andern das ich alhie in meinem newen Bistumb zu Eisleben (denn das seind jre hönische wort) Die Adiaphoristerei fast in allen predigten verteidige / vnd schreie / es sei nur ein weis kleid / vnd Euangelisire das selb weisse kleide ohn vnterlass / dass ich billich ein Apostel des Chorrock's möge genent werden."

From the same treatise may be quoted to stanzas II, XIII and XIV:

"Zum dritten das ich von listigen leuten darumb al hieher gefordert / das ich das volck zu den zukünftigen verenderungen des concilij zu bereiten solt / Ist E. E. W. genugsam bewust / das ich von den Wolgebornen vnd Edlen Herren / den Grauen vnnnd Herren zu Manssfelt jetzt Regirenden meinen genedigen Herren / vn durch niemandts anders / herberuffen / vnd zum Pfarherren vn Superattenden-
ten bestettiget"

The mutilation of *Agricola* into *Grickel* is also found in the pamphlet of the Mansfelt Preachers referred to above:

"nun kumpt ein ander Grickel oder Feltheyme / machts nicht viel besser /"

Whether the pun in stanza VIII ff. (*Werk* 'work' :: *Werg* 'oakum') is original with the writer, I am unable to say.

At the end of the whole, another hand has added these two lines:

Hutte dich Grickel bist witzigk
die welt ist auch gespitzigk.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.

GENERAL LINGUISTICS.

Die Sprachwissenschaft, ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse. Von GEORG VON DER GABELNTZ. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel Nachfolger. 1891. 502 pp.

THE constantly increasing literature on linguistics may arouse a pardonable envy with that generation of philologists who, scarcely more than a decade ago, had to grope in the dark before getting a proper survey of the field of their chosen studies. The view is now considerably clearer by the publication of the many aids which, in the form of *Cyclopædia*, *Grundriss*, *Compendium* or *Grammar*, fill a good sized library.

Von der Gabelentz, '*Sprachwissenschaft*' is intended as an introduction to general linguistics "for those whom we hope to meet later as our co-workers and successors." It is the result of the lectures given by the professor in the Berlin university. The manner in which the book originated may serve as an excuse—which the author pleads in the preface—for the somewhat incoherent form and the frequent repetitions; yet we cannot help regretting that more care should not have been taken to avoid what is rather disturbing and certainly does not add to a better understanding of the subject in hand. German scholars, with rare exceptions, seem to lack the happy faculty of presenting difficult subjects in a lucid style and perspicuous arrangement, readily caught by the eye, a feature so pleasing in English books and not detrimental to scholarship. The objection as to style cannot be raised here; the language is clear and simple enough, even such provincialisms as: "woher Alles die Bilder entlehnt sind" (p. 48) occur. But as the work bears on all possible points of linguistic history and method, often only

hinted at, the reader feels confused and wearied; many simple and obvious things are dwelt upon with undue prolixity, while more interesting and important questions are conspicuous for their disappointing brevity.

The frequent borrowing from other sources, necessitated by the extensive scope of the work, exposes the author to criticism, while many of his own views, not alone those that can be accounted for by his fondness for forcing the point, will call forth discussion elsewhere. Suffice it here to mention only a few objections.

No amount of reasoning will exclude phonetics from philology, as forming an integral part of it. The fact that linguistic investigation can not be carried on without this valuable science, not as a mere *Hilfsdisciplin* nor as an abstraction, but as the physiological explanation of actual human sound-formation, is sufficient argument for leaving the question in *statu quo*.—P. 200. Romance philologists will take exception to the quotation of It. and Span. *gato* as proof against the universal application of sound-laws.—P. 201. The remark that final *s>i* in Italian in *noi*, etc., is surely not based on phonetics. We have to postulate the series *nōs>noos>noes>nois>noi*. Perhaps this is only a slip of the pen, just as the surprising information (p. 158) must be, that French alone among the Romance languages is characterised by having nasal vowels. The further suggestion, thrown out as a hypothesis, that the nom. pl. of *o*-stems in Latin and Greek, for which the regular form would be, for example, *equoes*, *equōs*, Skr. *açvās*, may possibly be the result of a like development, is a clear case of how a neglect of phonetics may meet with its just deserts. Since the termination in *i* has been satisfactorily explained as arising through analogical influence of the pronominal system, occurring also in Celtic and Lithuanian, as well as in the gen. pl. of *a*- and *o*-stems—further reciprocal developments of the two declensions taking place in Greek (dat. sg., Skr. *tā-sm-āi* ~ *τῷ=ἰππῳ*)—this conjecture has no claim even to a "bold hypothesis."—P. 208. *st* in the second p. sg. in Germanic is not alone due to the affixed pronoun.—P. 213. To regard the origin of *s* in the third p. sg., pres., of the English verb as due to analogy with the sub-

stantive verb, would be unique.—P. 239. The explanation of the weak preterit in the Teutonic languages as illustrated by the formula *habai-da*, sounds a little antiquated! The derivation of *good-bye*, as given on p. 411, may be charitably called wrong, without submitting it to the eyes of English speaking readers.

These few points, jotted down while reading the book, are sufficient to show that the work has to be used with care. Yet, if read cautiously, it contains much that is well worth studying. The author's purpose has been, not so much to furnish a handbook as to lead the student through a linguist's workshop. And it is very instructive to follow the master through that part of the field where we recognise his authority. The one leading idea pervading the whole treatise, is that the scientific study of illiterate tongues is too much neglected; that the bearing of the philological study of languages outside of the Aryan stock upon the problems to be solved by linguistics, is not sufficiently appreciated. In general I would assent to this view, though I should make restrictions where the writer goes to the extreme. How many laws such as those of Grimm, Verner and Grassmann; how many *Lauthebungs*- and *Lautschwächungs*-theories; how many exceptions to the *Stammbaum*- or *Wellen*-theory; how many proofs for and against existing dogmas still lie hidden, awaiting the scientific explorer! Before the imposing structure of linguistic science, the grandest the human mind can conceive, shall be completed, ample room on the investigator's chart must be assigned to the neglected domains of speech material.

Referring to the title of the treatise before us, I am constrained to add a few further remarks which concern American scholars especially, and which, I trust, may fall on fertile soil. The languages of the American Indians, with their diversified structure, exhibiting all possible forms of development within their type, offer an exceptionally interesting and convenient field for the philologist. Many of our colleagues, particularly those who are less favored as to the practical use of their preparation for scientific work—and the number whose share is a "pars infidelium" is great—could employ their time

and energy in labor which gives promise of appreciated results. It may not be the taste of everyone to spend a summer vacation on an Indian Reservation, and many are not qualified for work that requires personal experience of this sort; but our aborigines are found almost everywhere, and these will prove the most docile and patient subjects on whom the beginner can practice. The phonetics of Indian speech are especially interesting. In some languages certain consonants formed in the same or nearly the same organic position, are pronounced as one sound of which the articulation is difficult to define; at times, this synthetic sound is differentiated, appearing as a labial, fricative, aspirate or liquid; or as a dental or its corresponding liquids, etc. In Hidatsa, for example, *b*, *w*, *m*, and *l*, *n*, *r*, *d* form such combinations.¹ In Shoshone, *p* and bilabial *f*, *l* and *r* interchange, according to my observation, before liquids and long vowels: *road* and *load* are the same to the Shoshone, the context showing which is meant. The laws of finals in this language seem to correspond with Mod. H. G. Sandhi laws find many striking illustrations; voiceless media here constitute one of the puzzles for the student. The morphology also of these tongues is no less interesting. Numerals, colors, the elaborate pronominal system, dual and plural formation of nouns (the former is nearly extinct in Shoshone, the latter is gradually replaced by analytic forms), tenses and moods, etc., all bear peculiar import for the investigator of general linguistic problems. The U. S. Bureau of Ethnology is doing some work in this field—as much, in fact, as the appropriation allows—but since many tribes are reduced to a few individuals, it looks as if the great scientific importance of this domain of human speech is not likely to be duly recognized before the last of the Mohicans shall have departed to his happy hunting grounds.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

A REVIEW OF DR. EMERSON'S
CRITICISM OF "GUIDE TO PRO-
NUNCIATION."

In the article, in the January number of MOD.

¹ Cf. J. W. Powell, 'Introduction to the study of Indian languages,' p. 12. Washington, 1880.

LANG. NOTES, on the "Guide to Pronunciation" prefixed to Webster's 'International Dictionary,' a good many things were let fall from the pen of the critic which ought not to be suffered to go uncorrected.

It is "strictly true" that the vowel-system of Mr. Sweet agrees, "in its general features," with that of Mr. Bell. The contrary is in no wise borne out by the alleged evidence from Mr. Sweet's recent 'Primer of Phonetics.' His high-front-wide, as there given, has the *i* in *bit* for the typical example. He does, indeed, make this to be, also, the initial element of what he calls (p. 74) "the long vowel corresponding" thereto, namely, the *e* as in *see*. But the length is made out by gliding on to a consonant *y* sound for the final element, with presumably a narrow form of the vowel taken on the way. This fashion of the "long *e*" is simply a peculiarity of Mr. Sweet's London English, which knows of nothing like the "long *e*" commonly heard in America, or the French *i* and German *ie* sound, these being examples of his high-front-narrow. The London "long *e*" is really diphthongal. So also is the "long *a*." And, indeed, the latter is ordinarily somewhat diphthongal in America. But here it commonly takes for the initial the narrow instead of the wide form; and the final, or vanishing, element is allowed but little weight. The difference between Mr. Sweet and Mr. Bell is merely a difference of pronunciation, or a different selection of examples, and does not in the least imply a difference in the general features of the system.

The reviewer finds fault with the different senses attributed to the words "long" and "short," and the variety of terms employed in relation to the subject of quantity. It is quite true that a gain may be secured on the score of simplicity by laying out of account a large part of the facts in the case, but obviously at too great an expense. It is also true that the vice of language which allows a single word to take on several significations tends more or less to confusion. But the only way to guard against such confusion is to point out and define the different senses. It is hardly fair that one should be charged with creating confusion, for the very reason that he takes the only possible means of obviating it.

Now, most phonetists will agree that, in the

English language, certain of the vowels have a quality that fits them for long quantity, so that they can readily and easily be prolonged in actual utterance; while others, of an opposite quality, are in a similar manner fitted for short quantity, so that they can be prolonged only by a forced and in some sense unnatural effort;—whether this difference in quality is what is signified by the terms “narrow” and “wide,” need not here be discussed. It is proper to describe those of the one set as “naturally long,” and the others as “naturally short;” for, though they may ordinarily be employed as actually long in the one case and as actually short in the other, they are not so of necessity. The English so-called long vowels are capable of being delivered with actual short quantity; as is often done when one of them forms the whole or a part of a syllable set to a short note; in singing, or of a syllable that takes short quantity in the rhythm of verse; and sometimes in a sort of hurried or abrupt emphasis in speech. And, on the other hand, when under the same kind of circumstances, a syllable containing a so-called short vowel is lengthened, the vowel takes a share of the prolongation. Thus we have the *naturally* as distinguished from the *actually* long and short. That the *a* as in *ask* is to be ranked among the naturally short, may be made evident by referring to the *a* in the French *à la mode*, *madame*, etc., which is the exact equivalent of the *a* in *ask*, and is commonly regarded as short; while the *a* in *âme* is unquestionably long, and in quality is more like the English *a* in *arm*. The terms “regular long” and “regular short” seem to have been especially exasperating to the critic; he having been, apparently, not aware that they were no invention of the “Guide to Pronunciation,” but had been adopted long ago under the sanction of high authority, to distinguish the more usual from the occasional long and short sounds of the letters. And he was certainly forgetful of the importance of the relations between the regular long and the regular short of the several letters. The allusion to “the old spelling-book with its five vowels,” etc., was wholly beside the mark. These five vowel letters still retain their old-time (though not their earlier) values; which are not even

discarded in any rational plan of spelling-reform, and are made to serve in the symbols for all the pronouncing dictionaries, except the ‘New English Dictionary.’ The relations in question have, indeed, no scientific basis, as expressly stated in the “Guide to Pronunciation,” the two sounds in each case being coupled only by the fact that they belong to the same letter. We know how this dislocation from the natural and proper relations came about; namely, by the survival of the old orthography under innovating changes of pronunciation. But that is not all we need to know of this matter. The relations so established are firmly engrafted into the very roots of the language; and they are, as by a sort of second nature, so inwrought into the minds of English-speaking people that considerable study of phonetics is requisite in order that one may disabuse himself of the idea that they are not perfectly natural and really scientific. Although thus purely adventitious, they are, nevertheless, a potent factor in word-formation, and as such are in living operation under our eyes and in our hearing at this day. Thus we have the “regular long” changed to the “regular short;” as in *grāve* and *grāvity*, *lābor* and *lāboratory*, *rēlate* and *rēlative*, *impēde* and *impēdiment*, *crīme* and *crīminal*, *cōde* and *cōdify*, *nātion* and *nātional*, *rē-cord* and *rēc’ord*, etc., etc. Though, in many such instances, the two forms may have arisen before the vowels took on their present sounds, the correlation is, at all events, an existing fact, and the tendency to these changes is now operative as occasions arise. All this for the reason that the two sounds in each case are represented by the same letter. If this is not to be ascribed simply to the influence of writing upon speech, it is the result of habitual association not grounded on natural relations. At all events, it is not a thing to be overlooked by a thorough student of modern English.

At this point the reviewer broaches his idea of a faulty confusion of the scientific and the popular, but on what ground is not clearly apparent; certain portions of the work are distinctly set off for scientific exposition; while, for the obviously important matters here in question, the exactly proper place was in those paragraphs supplemental to the explanation of

the vowel-system. The phonetics of modern English require a quite different treatment from the phonetics of Old English. In these and the other criticisms offered by the reviewer, no intentional unfairness is to be imputed to him; but they cannot all be accounted for except on the supposition of some degree of mental confusion on his part.

When the reviewer says:

"it is more common to regard [the syllable containing] a vowel followed by a single [medial] consonant as an open syllable," he is clearly mistaken, if the remark is to be understood as referring to the English language, and as applying to the case of short vowels in accented syllables. Thus, in *habit*, *citizen*, and the like, though the medial consonant in question is, indeed, divided between the two syllables, yet the first of the two, being accented, imparts accentual stress and prominence to its own part of the consonant, and is thus certainly a closed syllable to the ear, and is not only commonly but almost universally regarded as a closed syllable.

The reviewer is so possessed by the theory he has set up of a confusion between the scientific and the popular that he proceeds to find an instance of it in a statement, about the *a* as in *care*, in which there is really no sign of any intention of giving, or of suggesting, a scientific explanation, or of any thing more being intended than a bare statement of the pronunciation that goes customarily with certain combinations of letters. One part of his criticism here arose out of his failure to notice that the sound in *parent* is expressly mentioned as exceptional. The scientific explanation here offered by him is surely not correct; for it can not be the influence of the *r* that makes the vowel to be long in *care*, and short in *carry*, *parity*, *parallel*, etc.; and there is really here no distinction as between open and closed syllables. The only influence of the *r* in this case has been to keep the "*a*" long sound such as it was two or three hundred years ago, and to prevent its undergoing the change that has come to the same "*a*" long in other cases, as in *name*, *grace*, *fate*, etc. Of course, no scientific reason can be assigned why, at this day, some persons, in the words *Mary*, *wary*, *vary*, employ the sound of *a* as in *care*, and others that of *a* as in *fate*.

Dr. Emerson is anxious to vindicate the

reign of law, as opposed to the rule of caprice, in the determination of English pronunciation. What science is really able here to discover is rather tendencies than absolute laws,—tendencies growing out of the mechanism of speech or regard to euphony, or out of habits which the language has taken on. The idea of going back to the early sources of the language and tracing the sounds along the line of historic development, in a guide to pronunciation intended for popular use, or for the practical service of any class of persons, needs only to be stated to be at once rejected. The history of English sounds is an interesting and important subject for study, and embodies facts of great value to the philologist; but a fondness for this pursuit should not be allowed to obscure one's vision for practical ends.

Competent observers may be found in abundance who would bear emphatic testimony against the opinion so rashly expressed that the short *o* in English has, to a large extent, been superseded by an *a* sound, so that this mode is now rather to be regarded as the rule than to be stigmatized as a fault. Such a declaration may have effect like that of some prophecies which tend to bring about their own fulfilment, and should not be incautiously ventured by men who, from their position, should be upholders of stability in the language, not to say, guardians of its purity and vigor. One would like to ask Dr. Emerson how many of those whom he speaks of as "the majority of the educated Americans I meet" may have had their pronunciation modified by the influence of foreign models, or by familiarity with foreign languages. Among my own familiar acquaintance, there is one person only whom I hear using the pronunciation in question; and there can be no reason why I should not notice it, if it were to be heard from others within the circle.

It is an error, though taught by Mr. Bell, to regard the *a* (in *father*) as nothing but an "o" short unrounded. The real difference is in tongue position, the back-tongue for *o* being raised toward the soft palate, while, for *a*, the part of the tongue further back and down toward the root is approximated to the wall of the pharynx. This sets the *a* (as in *arm*) among the narrow vowels, with the *a* (as in *ask*) for the corresponding wide. To call the *a* in

father, arm, etc., "low-back-wide," with Mr. Bell, or "mid-back-wide," with Mr. Sweet, is inconsistent with the general characteristics of the narrow and wide, as explained by Mr. Bell. In the above indicated place in the organism there is ample room for a vowel station, which needs to be occupied to make the Bell-Sweet system complete, and so occupied relieves the system from some objectionable features. At the same time, the tongue position for the *a* as in *ask* is so nearly like that for the "o" short that only a slight change is needed to pass from one to the other.

The two forms, *Mahomet* and *Mohammed*, are, of course, independent transliterations of the original Arabic. It surely is not an impossibility that, as in the final consonant, so in the vowels, the diversity may have had its origin in a confusion between sounds somewhat resembling each other; and it was not fair to presume that any thing was meant other than this. Not unreasonable objection might indeed have been made to the assumption that the vowels had just the sounds of *o* in *hot* and *a* in *ask*. The form "*Mahomet*," if not directly from Medieval Latin, may have descended from *Mandeville* in both the French and the English. I find "*Mohammed*" and "*Mohammedan*" in Isaac Taylor's '*Fanaticism*,' as printed in New York in 1834,—probably one of the earlier instances of this form in English.

Objection is made to the employment of separate symbols for the vowel in *fern*, *earn*, *sir*, etc, and that in *urn*, *fur*, etc.;—it is an absolute mis-statement that the two are distinguished as narrow and wide. It should have been noticed that the condemnatory dictum passed upon the '*International*' is equally applicable to the '*New English Dictionary*' by Dr. Murray; since in that work we find two symbols employed in like manner, and with like reasons assigned for so doing: while it is admitted that the discrimination is not made by the majority, there is yet supposed to be a highly respectable minority of those who observe the distinction. It is not fair to presume that authorities, or the opinions of orthoëpists, are ever appealed to in any other sense than as evidence of actual usage.

Some attention ought to have been given to the modifications of the Bell-Sweet system

offered in the "Guide to Pronunciation." They are of so much consequence that, unless they are worthy of acceptance, they are serious faults, deserving of animadversion on the part of the critic. The most important of them are a different place in the vowel-scheme for the *a* as in *arm*, with the *a* as in *ask*; a different explanation of the "mixed" vowels, and the making up of a somewhat different list under this category; also a somewhat more precise explanation of the distinction between the "narrow" and the "wide." These are matters about which, for the most part, one cannot be competent to pass judgment who has not trained himself to observe the action of the organs in producing the sounds of speech.

SAMUEL PORTER.

National Deaf-Mute College.

THE SHAKESPEARIAN DRAMA.

Über Titus Andronicus. Zur Kritik der neuesten Shaksperereforschung, von Dr. M. M. ARNOLD SCHRÖER, Professor an der Universität Freiburg, i. B. Marburg in Hessen: Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1891. 8vo, pp. 140.

IN view of the many worthless volumes and essays that have been written upon Shakspeare, there is always some danger lest a new book however genuine its value, be relegated to that enormous category, and fail to receive the recognition it deserves. The book of Prof. Schröer reviews once more the whole much-disputed question of the authorship of "*Titus Andronicus*." In the Introduction, discussing the value of æsthetic criticism, the author says:

"Wenn sich in einem Jugendwerke eines Dichters, das durch hinreichende äussere Kriterien ihm zugeschrieben wird, die Folgerichtigkeit seiner Charaktere nachweisen lässt, so wird man in dem Werke den Dichter zu erkennen haben, gleichgiltig ob die Verwerthung derselben zum Aufbau des Dramas noch unvollkommen erscheint oder nicht; letzteres lässt sich lernen und entwickeln, ersteres weit weniger. Das Auffassen und Darstellen menschlicher Charaktere hat eine Art der *Anschauung* zur Voraussetzung, die rein *individuell* ist, und aus dieser individuellen Anschauungsweise haben wir uns die Individualität des Dichters zu reconstituieren. Dies nenne ich die *Typen seiner Welt- und Menschenanschauung*, und sie durch des Dicht-

ters Werke in ihren mannigfaltigen Erscheinungsformen, vom Stofflichen angeregt, doch das Stoffliche sich dienstbar machend, zu verfolgen, müsste die *ästhetischen Kriterien ergeben*."

This the author sets up as the starting point for the æsthetic judgment of the question of Authorship, and is the key-note of his whole book.

For merely practical reasons, he says, he divides his work into two parts—"die äussere" and "die innere Kritik." In the first part he discusses (1) "Ausgaben und Zeugnisse" (2) "Quellenfrage" (3) "Gegenwärtiger Stand der Ansichten über die Autorschaft des Titus Andronicus und Kritik der Behauptungen F. G. Fleay's."

Fleay's reasons for denying the Shakspearean authorship of the play, are taken up one by one and shown to be entirely without foundation. The question of Versification, which is one of Fleay's chief arguments, is discussed at considerable length. "Titus Andronicus" is compared with Marlow's "Jew of Malta," with Kyd's "Spanish Tragedy" and his translation of the "Cornelia," and with "the earliest example of Shakspeare's work," "Love's Labour's lost" and after tabulating his results the author (p. 47) says:

"Also, Mr. Fleay's Behauptung bezüglich der Metrik stellt sich ebenfalls, wenn man der Sache näher nachforscht, als grundverkehrt heraus."

The second part of Prof. Schröers work,— "Innere Kritik," he sub-divides under the rubrics Parallel Passages, Dramatic Motive and third, and most important, "Typische Charaktere." He now takes up the "Spanish Tragedy" attributed to Kyd, and examining it under the first two headings arrives at the result that

"Der Verfasser der *Spanish Tragedy* ist keine dichterische Persönlichkeit, die bei der Verfasserfrage eines Shakspeare zugeschriebenen Stückes ernstlich in Rechnung gezogen werden sollte." (p. 92).

Under the third rubric "Charakterzüge" the author lays stress upon

"Die Idee der Toleranz, aus der ich—um es gleich herauszusagen—seinen *Titus Andronicus* und speciell die Gestalt des *Aaron* als ein Shakspeare'sches Geschöpf erweisen will."

Continuing, he says:

"So wie sich die Toleranz im allgemeinen

aus der Menschenliebe, der liebevollen Betrachtung des Menschlichen ergibt, so erscheint sie im besonderen als Duldsamkeit gegen fremde Rasse, Religion, als humanes Erwägen des Menschlichen in den von der grossen Masse verabscheuten Fremdlingen und Andersgläubigen. Der *Mohr* und der *Jude* sind typische Gestalten bei den Elisabethanern, doch als *Probleme dichterischer Vertiefung und Ausgestaltung* sind sie nur für *Shakspeare* typisch. Dies ist das wesentlichste Argument, das ich von innern Kriterien für die Shakspeare'sche Verfasserschaft des *Titus Andronicus* geltend zu machen habe: den Zusammenhang der zwei Haupt Charaktere darin, *Titus* und *Aaron* mit anderen Charakteren bei Shakspeare. *Titus* ist ein Verläufer *Lear's*, *Aaron* aber, der interessantere, complicirtere Charakter findet seine Fortsetzung, Variirung und Vertiefung in *Shylock*, in Richard III, und in der Tragödie *Othello* zwar vornehmlich in *Othello* Selbst, doch zugleich nach der ursprünglichen Richtung hin variiert in *Iago*." (p. 99.)

The author then proceeds to develop this theory of "Typische Charaktere" with great critical acumen, and with a clearness and a *method* that ranks his book not only as a most important contribution to Shakspearean criticism, but to literary history in general and amply fulfills the task he has set before him:

"Mein Versuch, Shakspeare's Autorschaft für den *Titus Andronicus* nochmals zu erweisen, stellt sich demnach auch die weitere Aufgabe, gewisse Kriterien principiell zu erörtern, die nicht nur für den *Titus Andronicus* und nicht nur für Shakspeare, sondern für die Litteraturgeschichte überhaupt zu gelten haben."

To call attention to a few particulars of Schröer's book we will say that of especial interest are the numerous parallel passages and Dramatic motives here given, inasmuch as many relations between other youthful works of Shakspeare and his dramatic contemporaries are here disclosed; for example, on p. 80, between "Tancred and Gismunda" and Shakspeare's "Romeo and Juliet," on p. 81, between Grune's "Orlando Furioso" and Shakspeare's "Othello," etc. The "Register" at the end enables the reader to find such relations very readily, and we believe that everyone who would occupy himself with Marlowe, Green, Heele, Lodge and the other contemporary dramatists, will find many points in the present work which have not been before observed. Of much interest also,

is the hitherto much underrated Drama, "Lust's Dominion, or the Lascivious Queen" (The Spanish Moor's Tragedy), which is treated at length in the Appendix and its connection with "*Titus Andronicus*," "Othello" and "Richard III." pointed out.

A very instructive review of this book by Prof. Brandt has appeared in the *Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen* of Sept. 1891, pp. 708-728, in which Schröer's investigations of the "Typische Charaktere" are continued.

H. A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH POETRY.

The Poems of William Dunbar, edited with Introductions, Various Readings and Notes, by J. SCHIPPER, Ph. D., Parts i and ii. Published by the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1891. 4to, pp. 197.

A critical review of this work will be in place when all its parts are issued; for the present, we must call attention to the admirable plan, and to the accurate work so far laid before us.

English is used throughout in the notes and explanations, as well as in the introduction (Part i) which contains a careful bibliography and plentiful critical material. The text is a piece of luxury, in large, clear type, with ample margins about the quarto page; and the explanatory notes justify the adjective, being historical and comparative as well as philological. Admirable, also, are the remarks prefixed to each poem; such an introduction to the famous "Flyting of Dunbar with Kennedy" covers ten pages.

The order of the poems is mainly that followed in Schipper's excellent work, 'William Dunbar, Sein Leben und seine Gedichte,' Berlin, 1884. In this earlier volume, our author showed himself well fitted for his task, giving us an adequate and sympathetic sketch of a poet too often neglected by scholars and too little known by the public. This present edition of Dunbar reflects credit not only upon the scholar who has undertaken it, but also upon the learned body which puts it forth; and it only does justice, luxurious as all its appointments are, to the worth of a poet who alone

among the disciples of Chaucer was worthy to take the laurel from his master's brow.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANGLO-SAXON *gien(a)*, *giel(a)*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: In the MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, Prof. Hart, referring to a communication of mine to the London *Academy* of December 19, states that he doubts if the masc. forms *gien giena* can be found in "genuine Wessex texts," and is hence led "to infer that the word is confined to Northern speech," and that I, therefore, "have no right to use a Wessex **gien* (**giena*) in support of [my] theory."

Prof. Hart really challenges Sievers to give his "authority" for the use of the forms in his grammar. Prof. Sievers will doubtless answer for himself, but as Prof. Hart seems to imply that I must have gotten the forms from Sievers' grammar, I take it upon myself to reply to his communication.

I am not aware that the forms *gien giena* occur in pure W.S. texts. But Grein records seven cases of *gien* and one of *giena*, to which should be added, as Prof. Hart suggests, *gina* "El." 1070, Grein retaining here Thorpe's error, *gena*. We have all learned that it would not do to use the mixed speech of the poetical texts as a basis for grammar-making; but now that the laws of sound-change have been made pretty clear, for W.S. at least, have we no right to make use of the light they shed upon the forms of the poetical text? When in these texts, among the many W.S. forms that are familiar to us from the reading of prose texts, we come upon a form that answers all the requirements of W.S. genuineness, are we to drop it when we find it does not happen to have come down to us in prose texts? In O.E. poetry we have preserved a goodly number of antique words and forms, which the writers of the time were familiar with, but did not use in prose. Surely, Prof. Hart would not assign all these to non-W.S. dialects, particularly when they have good W.S. form.

My position is this; not only neuter forms (*giet*, etc.) but also masc. forms (*gien*, etc.) were familiar to West-Saxons, but the masc. forms (as I expressly stated in my communication to the *Academy*) early went out of use in the South, just as they in time did in the North.

That Prof. Hart does not find the word "in any shape in Sweet's O.E.T." does not prove that *gien(a)* was not in use among the West-Saxons at the time the O.E.T. were written, Sweet does not record any masc. forms, and the neut. forms he reports are in the Mercian V.P. In order to prove that *gien giena* were not in use among the West Saxons when the oldest W.S. prose texts were written, it would be necessary to show that there was in these texts occasion for the use of a word signifying 'still,' and that in these cases some other word was employed. This is not true of the little W.S. contained in the O.E.T., but is true of the texts covered by Cosijn. Such a test as Prof. Hart proposes, would come nigh proving that *gieta* is not a W.S. form: Sweet does not give it in his O.E.T.; it is not cited by Cosijn; it is late in the Chronicle, etc.

If *gien giena* are not W.S. forms, I, for one, shall be very glad to have Prof. Hart (who is the first to question the matter) tell us what they are. Should we apply his test, they cannot belong to *any* dialect, for he does not seem to have succeeded in finding them in non-W.S. prose texts either. Should we try to explain them away by saying they are W.S. adaptations of northern *gēn gēon*, etc., we are surely getting on very uncertain ground; moreover, the combinations *gē-* and *gēo-* were as familiar to W.S. scribes as *gie-* was.

Now that Prof. Hart has transferred the discussion of the word 'yet' to the columns of the MOD. LANG. NOTES, it may be in place for me to supplement here what I wrote to the *Academy*.¹

Similar to the use of *hina dag* and *und hita*, **gēohine* and **gēohit*, we have *oð ðisne deg* Bede 418, 20, and *nugena oð þis* 110, 13; 420, 25.

It will be observed that I offered with some hesitation an explanation of the *-a* of *gieta giena* etc., suggesting that

1. The '*þana þata*' in the *Academy* are, of course, misprinted for *þana þata*, as is also 'Germanic *in*, *in-hino*, *in-hito*' in MOD. LANG. NOTES, for *iu*, etc.

"the forms in *-a* might be wholly due to the analogy of the numerous other temporal adverbs in *-a*, or the way might have been led by forms in *-e*, like *hine*."

I would now suggest what seems to me, at least for *gieta*, a more satisfactory explanation. In Miller's edition of Bede I find *gyta* occurring three times (104, 32; 210, 3; 246, 15) and each time with an accent over the *-a*. This I observed with no other adverb in *-a*, nor, in fact, in the case of any unstressed vowel. If the *-a*, is long, it cannot be old in this position. Nor can its quantity be due to lengthening in final position (Sievers § 121,) for that applies only to stressed vowels; we should, in fact, look for shortening, especially in a word that is apt to become weak, just as *ealswá > eals(w)a*, later *alse* 'as.' May not the word be a conglomeration of *giet* and *á* 'ever,' which, exactly like German *noch immer*, could easily have come to mean no more than *giet* alone?

The idea that *gien* 'still, again' may perhaps have become confused with and absorbed by (on) *gēn < gēan < gægn* 'again,' must be abandoned; for at the time that *gien* disappeared, *ongēan* had made but little progress in the direction of 'again'; see the 'Oxford Dictionary' under 'again.'

I am not aware that attention has been called to the fact that in the early literature the temporal 'still' is rarely expressed by *giet* or *gien* alone, but that in the past *þá giet* is used, and in the present *nú giet* or *giet tódæge*, less often *giet oð þisne dæg*. The two latter expressions are clearly emphatic, but it would be very difficult to find in the *þa* and *nu* any force other than that of the tense, which is also expressed by the verb. At times one might translate *þá giet* 'then still,' and *nú giet* 'now still' or 'even now,' but I know of no case where 'still' or 'yet' is not fully as satisfactory, and in the great majority of cases this is the only admissible translation. Indeed, *nú giet* may, like simple *giet*, be strengthened by *tódæge* (Orosius 72, 10; 108, 19; Bede 262, 9.)

In the Orosius, including the passage from the Cot. MS., the temporal 'still' is expressed 18 times by *þá giet*, 9 times by *nú giet*, 6 times by *giet tódæge* and *giet oð þisne dæg*,—in all 33 times to 5 times *giet* alone (all five present tense). Bede shows (though I may, of course, have overlooked some) 10 (1 *git*, 9 *gen*) *tódæge*

forms, 15 *nu* (1 *get*, 2 *gyt*, 6 *gen*, 6 *gena*) forms, 39 *þa* (2 *get*, 2 *geta*, 11 *gyt*, 3 *gyta*, 5 *gen*, 16 *gena*) forms, or 64 compound forms to 4 (2 *gyt*, 1 *gen* æghwylce gear, 1 þonne gena) that could be construed as simple forms. In the 'Blickling Homilies' we see a decrease in the proportion, but there are still three times as many full forms as simple ones: no *todæge* forms!, 7 *nu* (3 *git*, 3 *get*, 1 *git*) forms, 11 *þa* (8 *gyt*, one each *giet*, *git*, *get*) forms, in all 18 to 6 (5 *gyt*, 2 present, 2 future, 1 past; 1 *oft gita*) simple forms. In Ælfric's 'Lives of the Saints' vol. 1, but few full forms remain, —7 (5 *pagit*, 2 *nugit*) to about 9 *git*'s; while in Byrhtferð's 'Handboc' not one of the 18 instances of the use of the word shows a *nu*, *þa*, or *todæge*.

In the above statistics (except in the case of Byrhtferð) I have limited myself to cases where the word has pretty clearly the temporal 'still' idea. This meaning was plainly the original one, and other meanings are very rare in the early texts. One of the first shades is that of 'for the last time,' 'before he died' (Bede 338, 27; 438, 6). Then that of 'again' or 'even' before *þriððan siðe*, etc. (Orosius 82, 7, etc). Even early texts show *giet* with comparatives (Bede 5, Orosius 2), and in the Orosius we find two cases of *pagiet* so used (78, 18; 162, 30). The concessive idea, 'yet,' 'nevertheless,' seems to be late; Byrhtferð has numerous cases of it (5, 20; 48, 4, etc.), but of the earlier texts I find only a few cases in the Orosius that approximate this notion (30, 17; 136, 11). The tendency to place the word at the head of the clause (Orosius 62, 9,) increases with its occurrence in the concessive sense (Byrhtferð *gyt* 5, 20, 187, 9, *andgyt* 48, 4; 150, 14).

A writer's use of *giet* might form a test of authorship, time, or locality; observe the proportion: Bede 64-7, Orosius 33-5, 'Blickling' 18-6, Ælfric 7-9, Byrhtferð 0-18; also Bede's 75 cases (in all senses) to Ælfric's 18, in about the same number of pages.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

ANGLO-SAXON *giēn*, *giēna*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In further consideration of Professor Hempl's very interesting etymology of O. E. *gēn*, *gēt*, etc. (*London Academy*, Dec. 19, 1891)

to which exception was taken by Prof. Hart in MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, so far as concerned W. S. *giēn*, let me call attention to the forms which these words assume in one important set of prose texts, viz., the "Gospel of Matthew" in four O.E. dialects (ed. by Skeat, 1887):—

North. (Cotton MS.) *geonæ* 12.46; *get l geana* 15.16; *geana* 18.16; *geona* 19.20; *nis ða geon* (nondum est) 24.6; *ge l geona* 27.63; and (added by Prof. Hempl) *gett l geana* 17.5; *get* 26.65.

Mercian (Rushworth) *gen*¹ 19.20; *get* 24.6; 27.63; *geta* 15.16; 18.16; 24.24.

W.S. (Corpus MS.) *gyt* 12.46; 15.16; 17.5; 18.16; 19.20; 24.6.

Kt. (Hatton MS.) *geat* 12.46; *geot* 15.16; 24.6; *gēt* 17.5; *gyt* 18.16; 19.20.

(Royal MS. 1. A. xiv.) *gyt* 15.16; 24.6; *get* 19.20; *geat* 17.5.

It appears from the above that Old North. as represented in this text has regularly (7 times) the diphthong *eo* (*ea*) in the form with *n*, and *e* in the form with *t* (3 or 4? times, *ge* probably for *get*).

Bouterwek in his glossary gives several other cases of the form in *n*, and always with the diphthong *eo* (*ea*).

Sievers (Gr. § 157.2) refers this Old North. *geona* to *u-*, *o-* umlaut (§ 160) and yet writes it *gēona*, in spite of the fact that *u-*, *o-* umlaut does not affect long vowels (cf. § 103 ff. and § 160). If this be the true explanation it would be necessary to assume an original short vowel, or the shortening of a long vowel not to be expected in this case (cf. § 125). On metrical grounds Sievers has shown, moreover, that *gēna* has a long vowel (cf. *Beiträge*, x, 500).

Professor Hempl's theory proposes to account for the Northern *eo* (*ea*) by assuming that the following *h* is here not "affective," while in *gēn*, *gēna* it has its usual effect (cf. Sievers, Gr. § 165, or for short *eo*, § 164). But if this is the true explanation, then *gēn*, *gēna* should be Northern forms, and *gēon* *gēona* Mercian; for it is in Mercian that *h* is not always "affective," (cf. Sievers, id., and my Diss. on

¹ These words were omitted from my dissertation on the Rushworth Matthew, at the last moment, for further consideration.

R1 §§21 and 63). Exactly the reverse is, however, the case in the above-cited forms. Furthermore it is not clear why *eo* (*ea*) should not appear in the forms with *t* in the North on the same assumption. But they appear only in the late Kentish text of Matt.

Again consider how the combination Gc. *ju* appears in the North and in Mercian; for example, North. (gospels) *ging*, *giung* (once), *giġoð*; V. Ps. *gung*, *guguð*; R1 *iungæ*, *iuguðe*, *iū*-, *gū*- *monnum*, etc. (cf. my Diss. § 38 e).

In connection with O. E. *ġet* the Frisian forms are usually cited in dictionaries as parallel forms.

Richthofen gives *ieta* (9 times); *ietta* (4 times); *ietle* (4 times); *eta* (4 times); *ita* (twice); '*eet*' (once); Modern Fris. *jietle*. Can these forms be explained on Professor Hempl's theory? (cf. Siebs, Paul's 'Grund.,' p. 733, § 22).

These suggestions are contributed to the discussion because the puzzling etymology of these words does not seem to me to be fully cleared up yet, though Professor Hempl's proposed derivation is in many respects a happy one.

EDWARD M. BROWN.

University of Cincinnati.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In reply to Prof. Brown, I would say that in my communication to the *Academy* I was careful to account for the *eo* in the Northumbrian forms by saying that the affection of the *eo* by *h*

"depended upon whether or not the initial *h* retained in any community sufficient of its consonantal value when it came into the medial position through the two words being regarded and accented as one."

Would it be at all strange if a community (or communities) where *h* was still effective, was one where the neuter form early got the upper hand? The literary use of *get* and *geona* side by side is no stranger than the simultaneous use of any pair of doublets of dialectic origin (for example, *sik* and *sek* in Chaucer, and *scuffle* and *shuffle* with us). It would be more difficult to explain the difference of vowel that my dialect presents in *god*, *dog*, *log* (with the *a* of *all*); *pod*, *hog*, *fog* (with the *a* of *father*).

As to the North.-Mercian representation of

Gc. *ju*, I do not believe it by any means certain that it might not be *geo*-. I have learned no satisfactory explanation of the doublets with *iū*, *geo*, but we all know that both forms were common in W.S. at least, although W.S. texts of some length show only one (Byrhtferð has many instances of *iū* but none of *geo*); so that the extremely few *iū*-forms found in North. and Merc. would not prove that *geo*-forms were not in use in the North. In fact Northumbrian has *geoc* Math. 11, 29 and 30 (cf. also Sievers §157).

As to the Frisian forms, the stressed vowel is explained by (Siebs, Paul's 'Gr.' i., pp. 723 ff.) §22, i, 2; §28, ii; §32, 4. *ieta* may be *iēt*+*ā* (cf. O.E. *ġietā* above) §29, i. *ietta* may be *iēt*+*pa* (cf. O.E. *pāġiet* above) §48, iv. This would require that *ietta* was (at least originally) used only in the past; but I have no means at hand to test the matter.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

RUSKIN AND SHARON TURNER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Professor A. S. Cook, in MOD. LANG. NOTES for June, 1891 (vol. vi, 345-347), discusses a passage from Ruskin's 'The Pleasures of England.' In this passage Ruskin has taken "for example of the Religion of our ancestors" a prayer which he asserts to be King Alfred's. Professor Cook finds "a curious parallel to it" in the pages of Augustine, and shows that the prayer is merely a translation of passages from the 'Soliloquies.' He continues:

"Alfred then, merely translated this prayer from Augustine, yet Ruskin speaks of it as 'personally and passionately offered to the Deity' by Alfred, and thousands of people who read his book are likely to take him at his word. Yet it would scarcely seem that Ruskin obtained his translation at second-hand. It is not identical with a rendering of part of the prayer by Thomas Hughes in his 'Alfred the Great,' ch. 16, nor is it the same as the version in the 'Jubilee Edition' of Alfred's works. . . . But if Ruskin did make the translation himself, he has not always seized upon the meaning of the original. It so happens that two of his inexact renderings are at points to which he has called special attention by comments."

After showing the inexactness of the rendering at these two points, Professor Cook concludes:

"Is it not a pity to spoil such effective rhetoric, and mar so telling an illustration? Perhaps; but there is a 'pity of it' on the other side, too, and it is one which will not have escaped the attentive reader of this note."

The charge of insincerity here brought against Ruskin is based mainly upon the assumption that he did not obtain his translation at second-hand. That this assumption is unwarranted is very easily shown. Wülker ('Grundriss,' p. 415, §481), speaking of translations of the Old English version of the 'Soliloquies' says: "Proben giebt auch Turner a. a. O. [History of the Anglo-Saxons] Bd. 2, S. 86 f." Reference to Turner discloses the fact that among the passages translated by him are those found in Ruskin. A careful comparison shows that Ruskin agrees with Turner word for word, with one trifling exception, namely, where Turner has "and through Thee all that live subsist," Ruskin has "and through Thee are living all those that are so." Ruskin then *did* obtain his translation at second-hand; the inexact renderings are not his, but Turner's. Further, Turner in this passage writes of Alfred's work in a manner that would naturally lead one who knew the prayer from this source only to speak of it as "personally and passionately offered to the Deity" by the King. Turner (Book v., Ch. v.) is speaking of Alfred's piety; after quoting passages from Asser on this subject, he says:

"But independently of Asser's account, we have two written records still remaining of the pious feelings of this admirable King, from his own heart and pen, in his Anglo-Saxon selections and translations from St. Austin's meditations, and in his additions to his version of Boetius."

After giving an extract from the version of Boetius, he continues:

"From the diffuse meditations of St. Austin, Alfred selected the parts which most pleased him, and has translated these into Saxon, with that freedom, and with those additions which makes his versions so often breathe his own feelings. As the King's heart is laid open before us in these chosen effusions, it may not be uninteresting to insert some extracts from them, as a further delineation of his real character."

The extracts are in three parts; introducing the second and third divisions, Turner uses the following expressions:

"After indulging in these lofty feelings awhile, he continues:—"

"One extract more, breathing the same warmth of feeling may be added:—"

Ruskin, evidently, was not a student of Old English; if he had been familiar with Migne, Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, Cockayne's 'Shrine,' and Wülker's 'Grundriss,' probably he would not have spoken of Alfred's Prayer as he did; on the other hand, if Professor Cook had known the authority upon which Ruskin based his remarks, he surely would not have written just as he did of Ruskin and Alfred's Prayer.

F. G. HUBBARD.

University of California.

ARTIFICIAL VOWEL-ROUNDER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—May I take the liberty to add one word to Mr. Raymond Weeks's remarks on "On artificial vowel-rounder" (MOD. LANG. NOTES, January, 1892)?

A few weeks ago I heard a young person, who was spelling to a little girl quite busy with writing a New Year's letter, whistle several times running when endeavouring to pronounce the French *u* distinctly. Then I was led to think that English people, in order to pronounce our *u* properly, should first whistle, then without changing the position of the tongue and that of the lips, try to give to *u* the French sound. Many a time have I made the experiment on English friends here and with success.

GUSTAVE FRITEAU.

Paris.

BUCHHEIMS 'BALLADEN UND ROMANZEN.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: From the list of typographical errors among the notes to Buchheim's 'Balladen und Romanzen,' (MOD. LANG. NOTES, Jan., 1892), is omitted one of the most unfortunate, namely that on page 301, which places the "Interregnum" at 1554-1573,—three hundred years too late. The student who has been taught to expect freedom in Schiller's treatment of historic material in poetry, would nevertheless do him an injustice in ascribing to him so gross an anachronism as would be implied by this comment upon "die Kaiserlose, die schreckliche Zeit."

Other corrections to this edition are:

Page 91, line 17, for *des* read *der*.

" 173, " 23, "*wirbe* read *wirbelt*.

" 17, " 27, should be omitted.

JAMES T. HATFIELD.

Northwestern University.

BEN JONSON.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The courtesy of Dr. Karl Menzel of the University of Bonn and that of my colleague, Dr. Hermann V. Hilprecht, enables me to identify the two following references, received too late to be incorporated in the Notes of my recent edition of Ben Jonson's 'Timber or Discoveries.'

Page 20, line 5: "No lie ever grows old," incorrectly attributed to Euripides by Jonson, will be found in Stobaeus, "Florilegium," 12, 2: Ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἐρπει ψευδὸς εἰς γῆρας χρόνον. Ed. Tauchnitz i, p. 255.

Page 76, line 12: "Solus nex aut poeta non quotannis nascitur" forms with slight variation the second line of the following distich:

Consules fiunt quotannis et novi proconsules
Solus aut rex aut poeta non quotannis nascitur,

attributed to Florus, 'Poetae Latini Minores,' ed. Baehrens, iv, p. 348.

The kindness of Professor Albert S. Cook, of Yale University, enables me to explain the marginal reference of the folio of 1641 to Megabyzus by the following anecdote and references:

Megabyzus highly commending some pictures that were meanly and ignorantly painted, and finding fault with others that were made with great art, the boies of Zeuxis that were grinding colours laughed at him; whereupon Zeuxis said, When you hold your peace, Megabyzus, those boies admire you, for they look on your rich garments and attendants; but as soon as you say anything concerning art, they laugh at you; therefore preserve yourself in esteem by holding your peace, and censure not the work or skill of any which is not in your way.

Ælian, 'Varia Historia,' Trans. Thomas Stanley, London, 1666. Cf. also Pliny 'Nat. Hist.' 35-36 and Plutarch, 'De Tranq.' 12, in which two cases the reply is referred to Apelles and addressed respectively to Alexander and to Megabyzus. Professor Cook very justly observes: "Evidently Ben Johnson got Plutarch and Ælian mixed, or else Zeuxis and Apelles."

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

BRIEF MENTION.

Professor John Lesslie Hall, of the College

of William and Mary, has published a rhythmical translation of the 'Beowulf' (D. C. Heath & Co.). It is not a line-for-line translation, although it is almost that, and it is almost as literal as is possible in any manner:

So Healfdene's kinsman constantly mused on
His long-lasting sorrow; the battle-thane clever
Was not anywise able evils to 'scape from:
Too crushing the sorrow that came to the people,
Loathsome and lasting the life-grinding torture,
Greatest of night-woes. So Higelac's liegeman,
Good amid Geatmen, of Grendel's achievements
Heard in his home: of heroes then living
He was stoutest and strongest, sturdy and noble.

From this brief passage the translator's doctrine may be inferred: a four stressed line cut at the middle point by a pause; a rhythmical movement resembling that of the original; considerable alliteration, with special care bestowed upon the "rime-giver," that is, the first stress in the second half-line; an attempt to retain much of the original order of words, balancing of phrases and parallelism, and to reproduce the color of the original epithets; some flavor of archaism. A complete examination of its merits must be reserved for an extended review of this translation, but the scholar will at once discover that Professor Hall has been very accurate in his renderings, and the general reader will find it possible to catch the unusual movement of the lines and proceed with ease and clearness from one episode to another. The book is handsomely and accurately printed. It is to be regretted that the lines are not numbered continuously as in the editions of the original text.

No. 39 of the 'Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts' (Stuttgart: J. G. Göschen) is a reprint of the oldest known edition, of 1725, of the 'Faustbuch des Christlich Meynenden,' the book which probably first aroused Goethe's interest in the character of Faust. Siegfried Szamatólski, who recently discovered, at Erlangen, this oldest print of the 'Faustbuch,' shows, in a valuable introduction to this present edition, the relationship of all the other early editions, and proves that they were all derived from the edition of 1725. Dr. Szamatólski also gives us a reproduction of the original, discovered by him in the Kgl. Kupferstich-Kabinett at Berlin, of the "portrait of Faust after Rembrandt," an engraving which one of Rembrandt's pupils, Jan Joris van Vliet, produced from sketches by his master, about the year 1630. The editor believes that there are good reasons for doubting whether Rembrandt really intended this picture as a portrait of Faust; it seems to belong to a series of heads of bald-headed, melancholy-looking men, which may have been drawn either for the peculiar expression or for the effects of the lights. Reproductions of two other Faust portraits are given; the first of these is a copy of the original, just discovered, and was drawn about the year 1680; the second one, the oldest print of which is found in the 'Faustbuch' of 1725, is copy of the former.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1892.

THREE UNIQUE ELIZABETHAN DRAMAS.

I.

THE work of George Gascoigne, the well-known author of 'The Steele Glas,' offers several points of interest to the investigator. Although a man of strong individuality, and for the most part working along well-defined lines, his versatility is his most striking trait. He seemed to feel a premonition of those quickening impulses which were to make the literature of the next two generations the greatest that England has produced, and we find him, so to speak, looking about for the best means and models by which to perpetuate his literary fame. As a result, Gascoigne has left us a larger number of "first attempts" than any other author in the annals of English literature, and the points of his contact with the history of that literature are many and important. This note will deal solely with the three dramas of Gascoigne, which possess this quality in common, that each is a unique example of a distinct species of the drama and the earliest specimen of its class.

We shall begin with a consideration of "Jocasta." This tragedy, which purports to have been "translated [from the Greek of Euripides] and digested into Acts by George Gascoigne and Francis Kinwelmarsh," was presented at Gray's Inn, as we learn by the title, in 1566,¹ and has been recorded by Collier as "the second dramatic performance in our language in blank verse."² "Jocasta" is a version of the "Phoenissae" and was "the first attempt to follow up the classical path opened by Gorboduc."³ As Warton long ago declared:

"It is partly a paraphrase, and partly an abridgement of the Greek tragedy. There are many omissions, retrenchments and transpo-

¹ Langbaine says that "Jocasta" was printed as early as 1556 in quarto. This is probably a mistake. See 'Dramatic Poets,' ed. 1691, p. 231.

² 'Hist. of Dramatic Poetry,' iii, pp. 6-11 and Warton, 'Hist. of Engl. Poetry,' iii, p. 70.

³ Herford, 'The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth century,' p. 150.

sitions, [although] the chorus, the characters and the substance of the story are entirely retained and the tenor of the dialogue is often preserved through whole scenes."⁴

Warton devotes considerable space to a comparison of Gascoigne's paraphrase with a literal translation of the "Phoenissae," and concludes that

"Our translators thought the many mythological and historical allusions in the Greek chorus too remote and unintelligible to be exhibited in English."⁵

This points to a scholarly and intelligent attempt on the part of the joint authors to adapt the Greek drama to the exigencies of an English performance, and Gascoigne has accordingly been credited by Collier with "the first-known attempt to introduce a Greek play upon the English stage."⁶

Now, from Gascoigne's own words we must infer that his knowledge of Greek was extremely limited,⁷ and we cannot but feel surprised at the selection of the "Phoenissae" for translation, and that so serious an attempt as the reproduction of a Greek tragedy in English should have been made so early in the history of our drama. On consulting Prof. Mahaffy, we learn that "no piece of Euripides has been more frequently copied and quoted than the Phoenissae."⁸ To say nothing of the modern versions of Racine, Schiller and Alfieri, there were parodies by Aristophanes, Strattis and Novius, and a free translation by Attius. The "Thebais" of Statius is on the same subject as is the "Thebaid" of Seneca, which is a compound of "the fragments of an Oedipus at Colonus and a Phoenissae."⁹ Before Gascoigne's play there was probably at least one French version, and Lodovico Dolce's "Giocasta," which the author describes as *gia di Euripide invenzione et hora nuova parto mio*, had appeared in 1549.¹⁰ Of the nature of Dolce's play I can not speak at first hand; but there is no reason to believe that it differs materially from the bulk of its class. In the words of Mr. J. A. Symonds:

⁴ Warton, p. 302. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 304. ⁶ 'Hist. of Dram. Poetry,' iii, p. 8. ⁷ 'Adventures of Master Ferdinando Ieronimi,' Hazl. ed. i, p. 429. ⁸ 'Hist. of Classical Greek Lit.,' i, p. 364. ⁹ 'Sh's Predecessors in the English Drama' by J. A. Symonds, p. 218.

¹⁰ Dolce's "Giocasta" is reprinted in vol. vi of the 'Teatro Antico Italiano.'

"Every tragic scene which the Italians of the Renaissance set forth upon the board of Rome or Florence or Ferrara was a transcript of Seneca. Following this lead our English scholars went to school with Seneca beneath the ferule of Italian ushers."¹¹

During the earliest years of the reign of Elizabeth the popularity of Seneca was unexampled. Between 1559 and 1566 several English authors translated him,¹² among them Gascoigne's intimate, Alexander Nevyle, whose version of "Ædipus" was written in 1560, although not printed until 1581.¹³ The "Thebais" itself was translated by Thomas Newton but probably too late to have had any effect upon Gascoigne's work.¹⁴

In the midst of so strong a Senecan and Italian influence, we are not surprised to learn that Gascoigne's version of Euripides is a literal translation of Dolce's Italian version of Seneca's imitation of the "Phoenissae"; and that only "the choral odes are in part original."¹⁵ Besides the closeness of the English play to its Italian original, for which I must take the word of Prof. Mahaffy and Mr. Symonds,¹⁶ both have called attention to the fact that the *paidagogos* or "gouverneur to the Queenes sonnes" is called *Bailo* in Gascoigne's play, the regular Venetian title for a tutor, and the word used by Dolce.¹⁷

This is not the place in which to expatiate on the Senecan drama, a dreary exotic happily incapable of acclimatization in English soil. "Jocasta" exhibits all the leading features of its species: "dissertation, reflective diatribes and lengthy choruses." From "Gorboduc" is derived its medium of expression, blank verse, and the dumb shows which precede each act. It is worthy of note that the dumb shows, which were the device by which the want of action in "Gorboduc" was remedied,

are not so needful in "Jocasta," which is fuller of event. The versification, in which Gascoigne's work is not especially distinguishable from that of his coadjutor, is smooth, the lines prevailingly end-stopped, and characterized by much regularity. While the derivation of the tragedy forbids any criticism of the plot or its conduct, we feel that the characters are at least as distinguishable as those of "Gorboduc" and that Prof. Mahaffy's estimate of "Jocasta" as "a motly and incongruous piece" is perhaps unnecessarily harsh.

For the sake of comparison, I shall quote the following short passage from Euripides and from Gascoigne. It has often been compared with a speech of Hotspur's (also quoted below), which Professor Mahaffy considers Shakespeare's "only direct obligation to Greek tragedy."¹⁸

Ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδὲν, μήτερ, ἀποκρύψας ἐρῶ
ἄστρων ἂν ἔλθοιμ' αἰθέρος πρὸς ἀντολὰς
καὶ γῆς ἔνερθε, δυνατὸς ὦν δρᾶσαι τάδε,
τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὄσ' ἔχειν τυραννίδα.¹⁹

"To say the truth (mother) this mind of mine
Doth fleet full farre from that farfetch of his,
Ne will I longer cover my conceit:
If I could rule or reign in heaven above,
And eke commaund in depth of darksome hell,
No toil ne trauell should my spirit abashe
To take the way unto my restlesse will." ²⁰

It need scarcely be premised that the following never came to Shakespeare through Gascoigne.

"By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap
To pluck bright Honor from the pale-faced moon,
Or dive into the bottom of the deep
Where fathom-line could never touch the ground,
And pluck up drowned Honor by the locks;
So he that doth redeem her hence might wear
Without corival all her dignities." ²¹

The following parallel may be noted as a matter of minor interest. In the dumb show which precedes the first act of "Jocasta," we find these stage directions: "Enter a king with an imperial crown upon his head very richly apparelled, etc., sitting in a Chariote very richly furnished, drawne in by foure kinges in their Dublettes and Hosen, etc."²² Did Marlowe have this passage in mind in the

¹¹ 'Sh's Predecessors in the Engl. Drama,' p. 217.

¹² Warton mentions the fragment of a translation of "Hercules Oetaeus" as preserved among the Cotton MSS. in the Bodleian Library by no less a hand than Elizabeth's, about 1561. 'Hist. of Engl. Poetry,' iii, p. 318.

¹³ Warton, 'Hist. of Engl. Poetry,' iii, pp. 311-12.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 315; also see Morley's 'First Sketch of Engl. Lit.' pp. 327-28.

¹⁵ Ward, 'Hist. of Engl. Dramatic Lit.,' i, p. 114.

¹⁶ 'Hist. of Classical Greek Lit.,' i, pp. 165-6; and 'Sh's Predecessors in the Engl. Drama,' pp. 221-22.

¹⁷ See "Jocasta," Hazl. i, p. 258, and Dolce's "Giocasta," as above.

¹⁸ 'Hist. of Classical Greek Lit.,' i, p. 366 note.

¹⁹ "Phoenissae," 503-506. ²⁰ "Jocasta," 2, 1, Hazl. ed. i, p. 287. ²¹ "Hen. IV." 1, 3, 201. ²² Hazl. ed. i, p. 259.

stage direction: "Enter Tamburlaine drawn in his chariot by the kings of Trebezond and Soria, with bits in their mouths: in his right hand a whip with which he scourgeth them?"²³ Or did both look back to a common original?

II.

Gascoigne's comedy the "Supposes" was performed the same year as "Jocasta," 1566, and at the same place. None of the particulars of these two performances have been handed down to us. However, that the "Supposes" was not unsuccessful is proved by its revival in 1582 at Trinity College, Oxford.²⁴ This play is particularly memorable as the first successful adaptation of an Italian comedy, "the earliest existing specimen of a play in English prose acted either in public or private,"²⁵ and from the fact that from it Shakespeare borrowed the underplot of "The Taming of the Shrew." "It seems peculiarly fitting," says Mr. Symonds, "that our comedy should have begun with a translation of Ariosto's *Suppositi*," which with the same author's "Cassaria" are placed next to the comedies of Macchiavelli by most Italian critics; for Ariosto seems to have been the first who conceived and carried into effect the idea of regular comedies in imitation of the ancients.²⁶

In the "*Suppositi*," says Ginguené, "his second comedy, Ariosto imitates chiefly the 'Captivi' of Plautus and the 'Eunuchus' of Terence";²⁷ and Ward commends the "free imitation of the manner" of the former, the "spirited and natural dialogue" and the graceful spontaneity of Ariosto's flow of language.²⁸

The "Supposes" holds an important place in the early history of English drama; for just as "Ralph Roister Doister" represents the direct contact with classical comedy and "Gammer Gurton's Needle" the emergence of the native comedy from the slough of the formless interlude, the "Supposes" stands as representative of that Italian influence which

in fuller flood was to become the source of the English Romantic comedy. As is well-known, Ariosto's comedy was first written in prose and afterwards rewritten in *versi sdruciolati* or endecasyllabic blank verse in supposed imitation of the ancients.²⁹ It is the opinion of Collier that Gascoigne took his translation from Ariosto's earlier prose version, but that he adopted some of the changes which Ariosto had introduced when he turned the play into verse. The critic concludes; "Gascoigne has added very little of his own."³⁰

If Gascoigne had the example of Sackville in his adoption of blank verse for tragedy, he certainly appears to have been the first to conceive the practicability of writing comic prose dialogue in English. The innovation of prose as the medium of comedy cannot but be regarded one of the most important steps in the history of the drama; and Gascoigne's use of sprightly prose dialogue in this place closely approaches the excellence of his successor, John Lyly.

Of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Gascoigne, Dr. Hunter speaks as follows:

"One of the most interesting circumstances about this play is that when Shakespeare in the fourth act introduces an incident which is not in the old play, he takes it from Ariosto's comedy entitled *I Suppositi*, as translated by Gascoigne.³¹ . . . My young master and his man exchange habits and characters, and persuade a Scenese, as he is called, to personate the father, exactly as in 'The Taming of the Shrew,' by the pretended danger of his coming from Sienna to Ferrara, contrary to the order of the government."³²

A very careful comparison of the two plays proves more than this, as the whole of Lucentio's subterfuge to obtain his mistress seems borrowed from the "Supposes." There is a similar entanglement in "The Taming of a Shrew," but there the exchange of characters between master and man (Aurelius and Valeria) serves no very coherent purpose, and the impersonation of the father is introduced by no such clever trick as that practised on the Scenese and the pedant of Mantua in the "Supposes" and "The Taming of the Shrew" respectively. In the "Supposes," Erostrato,

²³ Part II, 4, 4.

²⁴ Collier, 'Hist. of Engl. Dramatic Poetry,' iii, p. 6-11.

²⁵ *Ibid.* ²⁶ 'Studies in South Europe,' i, p. 109. See also Hallam 'Lit. of Europe,' i, p. 275, and Ginguené, 'Hist. Litt. d'Italie' ed. Milan 1820, vi, *passim*. ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 180 seqq., where a synopsis of the play will be found. ²⁸ 'Hist. Engl. Dram. Lit.' i, p. 144.

²⁹ Ginguené, vi, p. 170.

³⁰ 'Hist. of Engl. Dram. Poetry,' iii, pp. 6 and 7.

³¹ 'New Illustr. of Sh.,' i, p. 352.

³² Farmer 'On the Learning of Sh.,' Malone's 'Sh.,' i, p. 341.

the lover, becomes a servant in the house of his mistress' father, whilst his servant Dulipo impersonates him. In the play attributed to Shakespeare this episode has been alike developed and condensed, by making the lover, Lucentio, become the daughter's tutor. The charming scenes between the lovers, with the duplication of the device in Hortensio, have no counterpart in the 'Supposes.'

Hunter continues:

"The resemblance between certain portions of 'The Taming of the Shrew' and the 'Supposes' of Gascoigne was pointed out first, I believe, by Dr. Farmer, who observes that it was from the 'Supposes' that he [Shakespeare] got the name Pretruchio,³³ which he substituted for Ferando, the name of the corresponding character in the old play."³⁴

Mr. Malone adds that it was there also that he found the name of Licio.³⁵ Then comes Tyrwhitt, who suggests that the word supposes in the line:

While counterfeit supposes bleared thine eyne—
is in allusion to the title of Gascoigne's play."³⁶

III.

"The Glasse of Government," Gascoigne's third drama,

"A tragicall comedie so entituled, bycause therein are handled aswell the rewardes of Vertue, as also the punishment of Vices," was published in 1575.³⁷ This play belongs to the 'School-drama,' one of the forms of that wider cycle, "The Prodigal Son." Gascoigne's is the sole representative of this curious class in the history of English literature, although an examination of the writers of Latin comedy in Germany during the sixteenth century discloses more than a score of versions of this popular parable.³⁸ Mr. Hazlitt confesses

³³ Petrucio occurs as the name of one of the Scenese's servants in the "Supposes." See Hazlitt's 'Gascoigne,' i, p. 199.

³⁴ 'On the Learning of Sh.,' Malone's 'Sh.,' i, p. 346.

³⁵ This name appears in the "Supposes" as Lytio, servant to Philogano. Lucio is one of the guests of Capulet. "R. and J." I, ii. Cf. further the nurse of the "Supposes" and of "R. and J."

³⁶ See Malone's 'Sh.,' 'The Taming of the Shrew,' V, i, 120, where Tyrwhitt is quoted.

³⁷ Arber is evidently wrong in assigning 1565 as the date of the dedication of this play. See his ed. of 'The Steele Glas,' Chronicle, p. 4.

³⁸ Cf. Holstein's 'Das Drama vom Verlorenen Sohn,' 1880.

his inability to name Gascoigne's model and correctly declaring the style and construction as both un-English, suggests that "some of the incidents are in the manner of the early Latin dramatists."³⁹ Fortunately Mr. C. H. Herford, in his 'Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany,' has worked up the subject of the 'School-drama,' and thrown a flood of light upon this play and its originals. It remains for me to avail myself of Mr. Herford's interesting researches and here to acknowledge my debt to him.⁴⁰

Mr. Herford begins by noting two peculiarities in Gascoigne's use of the Roman situations:

"There is an obvious attempt (1) to combine with them a pronounced Christian moral; and (2) to associate them with the life of a modern university."

Then follows a *résumé* of the dramatic versions of the parable of the Prodigal Son in Germany from Macropedius' "Asotus," 1510, and Gnapheus' "Acolastus," 1529, to Stymmelius', "Studentes," 1549. Mr. Herford dwells on the great popularity of several of these plays and the number of editions through which both the "Acolastus" and the "Studentes" ran, thus leaving little doubt of the European celebrity of both plays. He adds that "all three dramatists must have been well known, at least by name and reputation, in the University circles to which Gascoigne belonged"; and calls attention to Gascoigne's presence in Holland, the actual scene of several of these plays. As further evidence Mr. Herford writes as follows:—

"Some parts of the plot, for instance the episode of the Markgrave, show familiarity with its [Antwerp's] institutions, and the figure of Eccho, a gay fellow 'known to all the town,' has something of the air of a portrait. Gascoigne's attested knowledge of Dutch itself involved a certain acquaintance with Dutch society and its current literature.

The external evidence then rather favors the view that Gascoigne was not a stranger to works connected by so close an affinity with his own. . . . Distinct copy of any one of them of course it is not; it is written throughout with a different bias; it is the work of a Calvinist, not a Catholic, or of a Lutheran; it is in the vernacular, not in Latin; in prose, not

³⁹ Hazlitt's 'Gascoigne,' ii, p. 347.

⁴⁰ For a synopsis of this play, see Herford, p. 150.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 152. ⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 152-158.

in verse. For all that, however, it assuredly belongs to the same dramatic cycle; it is an attempt, that is, to connect *Terentian situation* with a *Christian moral* in a picture of *school-life*.⁴³

Then follows a detailed examination of the relation of "The Glasse of Government" to the three plays mentioned, for which the reader must be referred to Mr. Herford's own words; this is his conclusion:

"There are plausible grounds for supposing that one of the most respectable pioneers of the great age of the English drama stood for a moment in literary contact with the most original Latin dramatists of the previous generation; that he met with their writings either in England, where they were in any case known by repute, or during the Dutch journey which immediately preceded the writing of his own play; and that he learned from them what no Roman or English dramatist could then have taught him,—the idea of a 'Glass of Government' in which the unsavory world of Roman comedy is boldly adopted with a Christian purpose, while the story of the biblical Prodigal is worked out, much enlarged and still more extensively 'amended,' in the sphere of the modern school."⁴⁴

There remains little to add. Mr. Herford has pointed out Thomas Ingledand's "The Disobedient Child" as the only other English version of the Prodigal Son, and called attention to a more distant parallel in Woode's "Conflict of Conscience."⁴⁵ Possibly considering the manner in which the theme of repentance is set aside in "The Glasse of Government" for that of a contrast between a virtuous and a vicious life in the young, the more familiar drama "Eastward Ho!" may offer as distinct a parallel.⁴⁶ The general theme finally received a vivid pictorial treatment at the hands of Hogarth in his series of 'pictured morals,' entitled 'Industry and Idleness.'⁴⁷

Aside from its origin and unique position in English literature, "The Glasse of Government" is really a remarkable play; excellent, if over regular in construction, rapid and logical in its movement, and clear in character-drawing. It is pervaded by the same sincere moral tone which has given "The Steele Glas" its popularity, but, barring the lengthy dis-

courses of Gnomaticus, is rarely inartistic. The comedy scenes are characterized by much lightness of touch and fidelity to nature, and the dialogue is worthy the translator of "I Suppositi."

In Gascoigne's day the drama was not yet out of foreign leading-strings, and the paths of Seneca, of Ariosto or of Plautus and Terence were the only paths in which its infant feet could tread. The dramatic career of Gascoigne is especially interesting from his varied choice of models; though not yet strong enough to stand alone, he sought for final independence through many guides. In the next generation Gascoigne would have been a great dramatist, as much beyond his actual achievements as these achievements are above these of his friend, Whetstone. As it is, he is memorable for the earliest specimen of a tragedy in English founded, however remotely, on a Greek original, the earliest existing specimen of an English comedy in prose, and the only example of the "School-drama" in the vernacular of England.

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES ON MORRIS AND SKEAT'S 'SPECIMENS OF EARLY ENGLISH.'

In Vols. i and ii of MOD. LANG. NOTES, were some excellent notes and emendations by Prof. Egge, which I trust will have due weight with the compilers when preparing a new edition. But in going through these volumes I have added a number of other corrections and suggestions, a part of which I here submit for consideration.

Vol. i, p. 3, l. 37, *wene we*. This is a question: 'May we at all call him mother, do we think? Yea we may.' Prof. Egge's surprise that the compilers have uselessly increased the difficulties of the text by reproducing the eccentric punctuation of the MSS., is shared, I should think, by most teachers.

P. 5. l. 121, *sorize* and *gelice deað*. The context shows that we should read *grislice*, instead of the unmeaning *gelice*. L. 127. The interpolated *and* is superfluous. 'As our Saviour instructed them, they taught many things.'

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 159-160. ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁴⁵ The plays are reprinted in Hazlitt's 'Dodsley,' vols. ii and vi: ⁴⁶ Cunningham's 'Chapman,' Plays, p. 450 seqq.

⁴⁷ 'A set of Twelve Plates,' published in 1747.

P. 10, l. 125, *Bryniges*. The note seems absurd. Why should they hang coats-of-mail on their victims' feet, when stones or other weights would answer the purpose? Thorpe's reading, 'fires,' is much more plausible.

P. 12, l. 79, *he wan . . . lx sol. of Alde-wingle*. The glossary translates *sol.*, 'shillings,' and this necessitates the violent interpolation of *ælc gær*. I should read *solidatas* 'solidates.' 'Solidata terrae. Modus agri ad valorem unius solidi. "quinque solidatas terrae in Beverstona." Du Cange, s. v.

P. 101, l. 64, *Hire feader feng on earst feire on, to lokin gef he mahte wið eani luue speden*. The note translates, 'began first fairly [kindly] to look upon her.' It is, 'began first fairly [kindly], to see if he might succeed,' etc.

P. 116, l. 162, *Schriſtes leaue* does not mean 'confessor's leave,' but 'leave of confession,' that is, leave given in confession. Confessor, in the A. R., is *ſchriſtfeder*.

P. 119, l. 260, *iſtiſhd* does not mean 'stitched' but 'adjusted,' from *stihten*, not from *stician*. 'Let their collars be adjusted high.'

P. 143, l. 55, *Stor ſigneſied gode werkes*. Here is probably an error in the MS., and for *werkes* we should read *biddinge*. The homilist is, as usual, expounding mystic meanings; and the context makes it abundantly clear that he took the gold to typify faith, the frankincense prayer, and the myrrh good works.

P. 230, l. 574, *Havelok*, in great peril, laments *that him ne hauede grip or ern . . . that wolde him dere*. Instead of *dere* (injure) I should like to read *nerē* (deliver), if I could find the word so late in use. The deliverance of innocents by the intervention of friendly griffins or lions was a common incident in romance.

P. 279, l. 1053. The editor has arbitrarily transposed two lines from their right places. The palmer is explaining why he could not enter the palace. The gates were shut because it was bed-time, and 'Modi had ordered that she' [the bride] should be led to her chamber.'

Vol. ii, p. 9, l. 243. Malcolm marries Margaret *as is wille to [him] com*. The *him* is an interpolation of the editor. I should prefer *hire*.

P. 24, l. 19, *pou vnderlaide alle þinges Vnder his fete þat ought forthbringes*. The translation in the note is wrong: it is, 'thou hast put under his feet all things that bring forth anything;' that is, all animals.

P. 49, l. 29. *Hoc* is a pruning-hook, not 'a scythe.'

P. 104, l. 184. *Hy byep glede of god onzyginde*. The note translates *onzyginde*, 'invisible;' but it is 'unspeakably' (from *zigge*); the *laetitia inenarrabilis* of the Vulgate.

P. 142, l. 125, *þe quene . . . as a mix þougʒt*. This *mix*, from *meox*, 'filth,' and used for 'vile woman,' is perhaps the origin of 'minx.'

P. 195, l. 70. Envy attributes the acidity of his stomach to *venim*, or *vermisch* or *vinegre*. The glossary translates *vermisch*, 'varnish,' which is not reasonable. It is probably *vernage*, a white acid wine. Cf. 'Awntyrs of Arthure,' l. 36; 'vernage in verrys and cowpys.' Until evidence is produced, I shall doubt the existence of varnish in the fourteenth century.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

A LITERARY MOTIVE COMMON TO OLD, MIDDLE, AND MODERN ENGLISH.

THERE are three poems of very different date which contain the same literary motive. These poems are the Old English 'Christ,' the Middle English 'Cursor Mundi,' and the Modern English 'The love of Christ which passeth knowledge;' the last-named being by Christina Rossetti, and published by her in her 'Goblin Market, and other Poems,' pp. 133-4. The common literary motive is an address of Christ to the individual sinner, in which appeal is made to the sufferings of the Saviour as a ground for requital by a corresponding love. In each, as is natural, the appeal is pathetic and moving. The similarities between these exhortations point to a common source for the motive. This I have not succeeded in discovering, and I, therefore, present the parallels to other students in the hope that they may be more fortunate.

The circumstances under which the sinner

is addressed are different in the three cases. In the 'Christ' it is the whole body of the condemned who are reminded of Christ's sufferings, and their rejection of the proffered mercy, as the ground of the condemnation which is to follow. The passage in question extends from l. 1380 to l. 1515, inclusive, but I quote only 1440 to 1469, and 1488 to 1497:

*þonne ic fore folce onfeng fēonda geniðlan,
fylgdon me mid firenum, fēhðe ne rôhtun,
and mid sweopum slôgun. Ic þæt sár for þe
þurh ēaðmēdu eall gēpolade,
hosp and heardcwide, þá hi hwæsne bēag
ymb mīn hēafod heardne gebýgdon,
þrēam biþrycton, se wæs of þornum geworht.
þá ic wæs áhongen on hēahne bēam
róde gefæstnad, þá hi ricene mid spere
of mīnre síðan swát út guton,
dréor tó foldan, þæt þú of dēofles þurh þæt
nýdgewalde genered wurde.
þá ic womma léas wíte polade,
yfel earfēdu, ðð þæt ic áne forlēt
of mīnum lichoman līfgende gēst.
Gesēoð nū þá feorhdolg, þe gefremedon ēr
on mīnum folmum and on fótum swá some,
þurh þá ic hongade hearde gefæstnad:
meaht hēr ēac gesēon orgete nū gēn
on mīnre síðan swátge wunde.
Hú þær wæs unefen racu unc gemēne!
ic onfeng þin sár, þæt þú mōste gesélig mīnes
ēðelrices ēadig nēotan,
and þe mīne dēaðe dēore gebohte
þæt longe lif, þæt þú on léohte siððan
wlitig womma léas wunian mōstes;
læg mīn flēschoma in foldan bigrafen
niðre gehýded, se þe nēngum scód,
in byrgenne, þæt þú meahte beorhte uppe
on roderum wesán rice mid englum.*

*Forhwon áhenge þú mē hefgor on þinra honda
róde,*

*þonne þu hongade? Hwæt! mē þeos heardre
þynceð:*

*nū is swēerre mid mec þinra synna ród,
þe ic unwillum on bēom gefæstnad,
þonne seo ððer wæs, þe ic ēr gestág
willum mīnum, þá mec þin wēa swiðast
æt heortan gehrēaw, þá ic þec from helle
átēah,
þær þú hit wolde sylfa siððan gehealdan.*

*It wæs on worulde wēdla, þæt þú wurde
welig on heofonum;
earm ic wæs on ēðle þinum, þæt þú wurde
ēadig on mīnum.*

In the 'Cursor Mundi' it follows upon the account of the crucifixion, occupying lines 17111 to 17270. The Fairfax and Trinity MSS. do not have it, but the Cotton and Göttingen MSS. do. Our text is from the Cotton MS., and is an excerpt comprising only lines 17111 to 17178, inclusive. Here it forms part of a dialogue between Christ and Man:

*Iesus o maria born
For sinful man þat was for-lorn
I forsok mi fader blis,
And com in-til erth, i-wis.
I lete me tak and herd bind
For luue i had to mans kind,
I thold pouerd, pine, and scame,
Al for sinful mans name.
Thinc, ai thinc, ai sinful man,
þou thinc on iesu, þi lemman.
I stode naked als i was born
þe wicked Iuus þaim bi-forn,
Bunden til a piler fast,
To-quils þe bandes moght last;
On mi back i bar þe rode,
Quen i unto mi ded yode,
Had neuer man sa mikel scam
In erth for nakins blan.
þou sinful man þat gas bi me,
Duel a quile and þou mai se,
Duell a quile and fond to stan,
Bi-hald mi fote, bi-hald mi hand!
Mi bodi es wit scurges suongen,
Brest, and hand, and fote thurghstungen.
I hing apon þis herd rode,
For þe i gaf mi hert blode;
þe thornnes o mi hede standes,
Thirled am i, fete and handes.
Bi-hald and se mi blodi side,
þat for þi luue es opend wide;
Put in and grappe, mi suet freind,
Tak ute mi hert bituix pine hend;
þan mai þou wit pine eien se
Hu treuli man i luued þe.
Fra mi crun unto mi ta
Ful i am o pine and wa;
Bituix tua theifs hing i here*

*Als i theif and traitur wer,
 Befor mi moder eien, mare,
 Sufferd i al pis wilani.
 I haf þus mani blodi wondes,
 And sufferd her pis herd stondes,
 And ded on pis rode tre,
 þou sinful man! for luue o þe.
 Sin i haf þe sua dere boght,
 Quat ailes þe þou luues me noght?
 Wit þi sin þou pines me,
 Als did þe Iuus on rode tre.¹
 þou sinful man! if þou cuth god,
 Oft bird þe thinc a-pon mi blod
 Night and dai, and al þe time,
 Wel bird þe thinc a-pon mi pine.
 Waila wai! þou sinful man,
 Ne haf i mad þe mi lemman,
 Ne haf i gin þe al mi blis,
 And mi-self þar-wit, i-wiss,
 If þou neuer sa nobul war;
 Quat thing moght i giue þe mare?
 I wat neuer o nakins wise.
 þan bird þe thinc ai to rise,
 Suith to rise and faand to blin,
 And for mi luue for-sak þi sin.
 For-sak þi sin þur charite,
 And faand to rise, and com to me!
 I sal þe hals, i sal þe kiss,
 And bring þe to mi fader blis.*

The third, Miss Rossetti's poem, appears as a lyric, with nothing to show that its original or model formed part of a larger whole:

I bore with thee long weary days and nights,
 Through many pangs of heart, through many
 tears;
 I bore with thee, thy hardness, coldness, slights,
 For three and thirty years.

Who else had dared for thee what I have dared?
 I plunged the depth most deep from bliss
 above;

I not My flesh; I not My spirit spared:
 Give thou Me love for love.

For thee I thirsted in the daily drouth,
 For thee I trembled in the nightly frost:
 Much sweeter thou than honey to My mouth:
 Why wilt thou still be lost?

1. At this point in the Göttingen MS occur these two additional lines:

*wid athes grete and wick dede,
 oft þu geris mi wondis blede.*

I bore thee on My shoulders and rejoiced:

Men only marked upon My shoulders borne
 The branding cross; and shouted hungry-
 voiced,
 Or wagged their heads in scorn.

Thee did nails grave upon My hands, thy name
 Did thorns for frontlets stamp between Mine
 eyes:

I, Holy One, put on thy guilt and shame;
 I, God, Priest, Sacrifice.

A thief upon My right hand and My left;
 Six hours alone, athirst, in misery:
 At length in death one smote My heart and
 cleft
 A hiding-place for thee.

Nailed to the racking cross, than bed of down
 More dear, whereon to stretch Myself and
 sleep:

So did I win a kingdom,—share My crown;
 A harvest,—come and reap.

If it were certain that these should be
 brought into relation with passages in the
 English Mystery Plays, perhaps a clue might
 be secured. I refer to such parts as the speech
 of Christ in the York Play of the Crucifixion,
 p. 357:

*Al men þat walkis by waye or strete,
 Takes tente ze schalle no trauayle tyne,
 By-holdest myn heede, myn handis, and my
 feete,
 And fully feele nowe or ze fyne,
 Yf any mourning may be meete
 Or myscheue mesured vnto myne.*

Or to the beginning of the 'Harrowing of
 Hell' in the same cycle, p. 372:

*Manne on molde, be meke to me,
 And haue thy maker in þi mynde,
 And thynke howe I haue tholid for þe,
 With pereles paynes for to be pyned,*

Or, finally, to the first lines of the 'Harrowing
 of Hell' in the Towneley Mysteries ('York
 Plays,' p. 372):

*My fader me from blys has send
 Tille erth for-mankynde sake,
 Adam mys for to amend,
 My deth nede must I take.*

*I dwellyd ther thyrty yeres and two
And somdele more, the sothe to say,
In anger, pyne, and mekylle wo,
I dyde on cros this day.*

See also the 'Harrowing of Hell' (from MS. Harl. 2253), lines 43-58; Towneley Mysteries, 'Judithum,' following the words, *Tunc expandit manus suas et ostendit eis vulnera sua*, pp. 315-316 of the Surtees Society Edition; and especially the Towneley 'Resurrectio Domini,' pp. 259-261 (cf. Chester Plays, ed. Wright, pp. 89-90).

The passage from the Crucifixion Play seems to be based on Lamentations 1, 12. Is it possible that this verse, from a chapter anciently much used as a Scripture lesson in Passion Week (cf., for example, Mone, 'Schauspiele des Mittelalters,' p. 204), may be the germ of the longer addresses?

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD IN THE PATOIS OF CACHY (*Somme*).

THE Latin verb in its development into the Neo-Latin suffered a diminution in the number of its tenses. This diminution has been greater in the language of the peasant than in the literary language. The literary language adhered to the Latin usage in the sequence of tenses. The language of the peasant is less accurate in its distinctions and makes a present tense serve as a past and a past tense as a present.

In the patois of Cachy the present subjunctive of the verbs HABERE and ESSERE has been lost, and the Latin pluperfect is used as a present subjunctive:—

k'z'üs	k'z'füs
k't'üs	k'tü füs
k'il üš	k'i füs
k'oz üšöš	k'o füsöš
k'oz üšgš	k'o füsğš
k'iz üšt.	k'i füst.

In O. Picard both the present and imperfect subjunctive of these verbs existed.¹

One of the peculiarities of the conjugation of

¹ De Wailly, "Observations grammaticales sur les Chartes françaises d'Aire": *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxxii, 306.

verbs in the patois of Cachy is the termination -š for all verbs in the present subjunctive. It is found in this tense in the O. Picard, although its use is not general. There are only two cases of it in the third person singular of the works examined by De Wailly: *lievreche* (K. 7); *fache* (J. 99). No example is noted by Krull in 'Guy de Cambrai.' In De Wailly's *chartes* this ending is also found for the first person of the pres. indic.: *fache* (J. 99); *mech* (E. 21); *faich* (C. 2); but also *fai* (E. 1.) and *met* (M. 84), and, on account of the last two forms, De Wailly thinks the *ch* was mute in the first three. From verbs such as these it went over to all verbs, and spread through all persons of the present subjunctive. In the 'Célèbre Mariage' (seventeenth century) this form is general in that tense: *soz euchié chi esté* (5); *pour eq j'el croiche* (Crinon, Sat., i, 7); *qu'i feut qu'j'el voiche* (*ibid.*, i, 8); *fawra qu'cha-quein . . . meuche sin blé* (*ibid.*, i, 30).

Raynaud's theory with regard to the *ch* is, that in the subjunctive, as in the indicative, the verbs of the first conjugation were assimilated to those from the second and fourth Latin conjugations in -EO and IO, and the sibilant was produced by the yod of these terminations. Hence *porš*, pres. subj. of *porti* represents a Latin type *PORTIAM.² The theory of Suchier is that *ch* in the first person sing. of the pres. indic., which is found in the early texts only after *t* (DEFENDO > *defençh*; MITTO > *mech*; ARDIO > *arch*; SENTIO > *sench*) arose from the necessity of distinguishing the first person from the third person in which the *t* was still pronounced.³ He also believes that the -*ch* went into the subjunctive from the first person singular of the pres. indic.⁴

The present state of the patois is an argument against the first part of Suchier's theory that the *ch* was introduced into the first person to differentiate it from the third person. For, granting for the moment that the subjunctive has taken the *ch* from analogy with the indicative, it has been taken into all three persons of the singular of the subjunctive, so that no need of the differentiation of these persons seems to be felt. Why then should it have been felt in the indicative? The early docu-

² *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxxvii, 349.

³ Gröber's 'Grundriss,' i, 608.

⁴ *ibid.*, i, 618.

ments in Picard show that this *ch* never had any great currency in the indicative. Hence there is small probability that it had strength enough to establish the type for the subjunctive.

I believe the origin of this *ch* is an entirely different one from that suggested by Raynaud and Suchier. In Picard, Latin *c+i* and *c+e* passed through the stages *kj*, *tj*, *tʃ*, and *t+i* through the stage *tj>tʃ*; the *tʃ* stage is the one which we find in 'Aucassin et Nicolète.' Final *tʃ* of the O. Pic. has gone on to *ʃ* in modern Picard. Hence each of these terminations has given *-ʃ* in the modern patois. This *-ʃ* first arose in the subjunctive in those verbs which, in the Latin had in the pres.

subj. the ending *CI*, *TI*, *CE*. The form *fache* (*FACIAM*) is one of those found by De Wailly.⁵ From this class of verbs it spread to all others.

In the forms of the present subjunctive from *ESSERE* and *HABERE* given above, there is a crossing of the present with the imperfect subjunctive. The O. Pic. stem of the imperfect subj. is combined with the termination of the pres. subj. to form a new pres. subjunctive.

No preterit tense exists in this patois, and the imperfect and present perfect supply its place. The pluperfect takes the place of the past anterior which is not in use.

T. LOGIE.

Williams College.

THE BATTLE OF MALDON.*

He ordered then each warrior-youth to let his charger go,
To drive him far afield, and forward march against the foe,
Relying on his strong right arm and on his courage good.
Then Offa's kinsman truly for the first time understood
The earl would never cowardice endure nor pass it by;
So from his hand into the wood his falcon he let fly,
And to the battle stepped; from this, the youth, as one might know,
At war would never weaken when his hand had strung the bow.
With him, Eadric wished to aid in fight his lord and king,
Made ready to the battle-field his ready spear to bring;
He had a good stout mind, the while his good stout hand could wield
With equal skill in battle-play the broad sword and the shield.
And he, that day, bore out his boast, made good his solemn word
That he would fight upon the field before his king and lord.
Then Byrhtnoð, riding up and down, began to range his band,
To cheer his men and teach them how as warriors they should stand,
Should keep their place; and boldly then he counseled them and bade
That they should firmly hold their shields and never be afraid.
When he had well arrayed his ranks, he reached a little group,
Dismounted where he saw them stand, his own most dear hearth-troop.

The vikings' herald sharply called, he stood upon the shore,
And to the earl the pirates' message boasting he bore:
"They send and bid me say to thee, a troop of seamen bold,
That thou must quickly send to them, for thy protection, gold;
And that ye buy off this attack, for you is better far
Than that we both together share the cruelties of war.
No need for us to kill if ye but haste to this release,
For sake of gold we will confirm with you a lasting peace.
If thou, who art so greatly rich, to this will but agree,
That thou thy people thus redeem and thus thy folk set free,
Pay to the seamen at their choice a fee for sake of peace,

⁵ *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, xxxii, 317.

*Translated from the Old-English.

Receive a treaty at our hands and thus obtain release,
Then with the tribute we at once unto our ships will go,
Stand out to sea, and truly swear to keep the peace with you."

Byrhtnoð then spoke; he grasped his shield, his slender spear he turned;
He answered him—he spoke in words—his words with anger burned:
"And wilt thou hear now, pirate, what this people wish to say?
For tribute they to you will naught but trusty weapons pay—
The poisoned spear, the olden sword, just such as these ye see,
War-trappings which to you, I ween, in war will worthless be.
Go back, O pirate-messenger, proclaim it if thou wilt,
Say to the folk who sent thee here a fiercer message still;
Tell them that here a noble earl, with all his warrior band,
Stands who will shield and shelter this his home and native land—
My native land, my father's land, the land of Æthelred—
The heathen who have sent thee here shall every one lie dead.
Meseems 'twere too disgraceful to allow you thus to go
With money to your ships, unfought, without a single blow,
Now that ye thus have hither come into our land so far;
Nor shall ye levy tribute thus without a taste of war.
We first must satisfy ourselves in savage battle-play,
With keen sword-edge and sharp spear-point, before we tribute pay."

He ordered then his men to march; their shields aloft they bore,
Until they reached their station there and stood along the shore.
Because of water, neither troop the other troop could reach;
The billows streamed, the flood-tide flowed along the sandy beach;
And, waiting thus with chafing mind, to them it seemed too long
Ere they together thrust their spears in close and clashing throng.
There they beset old Panta's stream, in close array they pressed,
The vanguard of East-Saxons, the spear-troop, and the rest;
Nor could they do each other hurt, nor harm each other there,
Save when some one received his death by shaft-flight through the air.
At length the flood ebbed outward; the pirates eager stood,
The vast array of vikings bold, eager for war and blood.
The hero-leader ordered then the bridge to keep and hold
A warrior who was Wulfstan hight, a warrior battle-bold.
He was the son of Ceola, and brave, with all his race;
And when the foremost, boldest man stepped on the bridge apace,
Brave Wulfstan smote him with his spear, and struck him from his place.
There stood with Wulfstan (that brave man), supporting him amain,
Stood Maccus and Ælfhere there, a most courageous twain.
And from the passage at the ford they fled not nor gave back,
But fastly they protected it against the foe's attack.

When thus the heathen crew perceived the stanch bridge-warders stand,
Dissimulating, then, they dared to make this bold demand:
That we should let them cross the ford, and lead their troops to land!
The earl, moved by his pride, gave land to all that hostile crowd,
And o'er the water cold his men could hear him call aloud:
"And now the way is opened, come you at us fair and close;
And who may hold the battle-field at last God only knows."
And then the war-wolves waded in, they recked not of the stream,

The tribe of vikings trooping westward over Panta came.
 Over the flashing water, high aloft their shields they bore,
 The pirates brought their shining shields unto the hither shore.
 And there against the enemy, just as they came to land,
 All ready for their rough attack, stood Byrhtnoð and his band.
 He ordered them with shields to form a phalanx firm and close,
 And hold it fast with might and main against their savage foes.
 Then was the battle bravely fought upon that bloody field—
 The day was come when dooméd men in death must fall and yield.
 The raven circled through the air—a clamor rose on high—
 The eagle carrion-greedy—and on earth there was a cry.

Warriors were hurling their spears hard as iron, their spear-points sharp-
 ground from their hands they let fly,
 And the bows were full busy, each shield caught a spear-head, and fierce was
 the battle-rush, brave men were falling, and warriors on all sides were
 sinking to die.

Then Wulfmær, Byrhtnoð's sister's son, was wounded unto death,
 Hewn down with swords he sank to earth and drew his latest breath.
 But counter-woe was given then unto the pirate horde,
 For I have heard that Edward slew one of them with his sword.
 His stroke was strong, he swung his sword, its swing he did not spare
 Until the warrior at his feet fell doomed and lifeless there.
 For this, the king, his master, whom as chamberlain he served,
 Spoke, when occasion came, the thanks the deed so well deserved.
 So stood they firm and fierce of mind, the warriors at their strife,
 And each sought eagerly how he might soonest take a life—
 The warriors with their weapons sought among the dooméd men
 Who there could first, with sword and spear, obtain a life—and then
 Death came on earth. Steadfast they stood. Byrhtnoð once and again
 Incited them to think on war who glory would obtain
 Each warrior who would win renown against th'accurséd Dane.
 Then came a war-brave trooper forth, and lifting high his lance,
 With shield-guard up, he then began against the chief to advance.
 The earl, so resolute and brave, in turn against him went,
 And each of them to harm the other then was fully bent.
 The pirate hurled a southern spear—the earl was wounded first,
 But shoved then with his shield at once until the shaft he burst—
 He sprang it till it sprang again—more angry yet he grew—
 The pirate proud who wounded him he with a spear pierced through.
 The warrior was skillful,—in the close and heated strife,
 He thrust his fierce foe through the neck and touched his very life.
 Then he another quickly pierced, his corslet burst apart,
 The poisoned shaft through mail and breast stood sticking at his heart.
 The earl was but the blither, and he laughed—the man so brave—
 And for the day's work God had given, to God his thanks he gave.
 A certain warrior hurled a spear, and forth it swiftly sped,
 And, flying from his hand, it pierced thethane of Æthelred.
 But by his side stood Wulfstan's son, a boy, the young Wulfmaer,
 Who from the warrior's side full boldly drew the bloody spear;
 He let the hard shaft go again, he hurled it far away;
 It pierced the man who struck his lord, till on the ground he lay.

Then came a trooper to the earl, to rob the noble lord,
 To steal his jeweled coat of mail, his ornamented sword;
 But Byrhtnoð from its ready sheath drew forth his sword full length,
 Broad and brown-edged, and on the corslet smote with all his strength.
 Yet all too quickly hindered him one of the pirate band,
 And stayed the progress of his arm and marred his good right hand
 So that he could no longer hold the fallow-hilted brand,
 No longer wield his trusty blade, it dropped upon the strand.
 Yet still he spoke courageously, the warrior gray and old,
 He cheered his men and urged them on, his comrades good and bold.
 He could no longer firmly stand upon his faltering feet—
 He looked to heaven:

"O Lord, thou Ruler of mankind, my thanks I render thee
 For all the mercies in this life thou hast bestowed on me.
 And now, O Lord, most gracious God, of thine own graciousness,
 Pity me in my direst need and in my deep distress.
 Be good to my poor spirit, Lord, and grant, I humbly pray,
 My soul into thy shining realm may shortly make its way,
 May go, O King of angels, thither in peace and rest,
 Where, I entreat thee, hell's fierce foes may nevermore molest."
 And then the heathen hewed him down, those warriors fierce and grim,
 And both his shoulder-comrades, too, the men who stood by him;
 The twain who bravely stood by him were Ælfnod and Wulfmaer;
 They gave their lives beside their lord, and lay together there.

Then fled they from the field where they no longer wished to be.
 The sons of Odda were the foremost from the field to flee;
 Godric, the son of Odda, fled—forsook and left behind
 The man who many a time to him had been so good and kind,
 Had given him horses—and yet now on that same lord's own steed
 He and his brothers with him leaped and rode away full speed.
 They took the trappings with his horse—surely that was not right—
 Godrinc and Godwig left the field, they cared not for the fight,
 And on their lord's own battle-horse rode off in headlong flight;
 And turning from the battle-plain, they sought the distant wood
 And fled into a fortress there which for protection stood,
 And there secured themselves. So others—many more than should,
 If they had then remembered all the kindness and the good
 The earl for them had done in life—their chief now lying dead.
 Thus Offa in the council-room in former days once said,
 When he a council held, that many spoke in pride secure,
 Boasting of what, in direst need, they never would endure.

And thus there fell the people's prince, the earl of Æthelred;
 His hearth-companions all then saw their leader lying dead;
 Eager and brave, they hastened forth, resolved to do or die,
 Resolved t'avenge their leader's death or by his side to lie.
 Ælfwine, Ælfric's son, then spoke, a warrior young of years,
 And speaking boldly urged them on—his speech betrayed no fears:
 "Remember ye the times when we at mead have spoke so oft,
 And on the bench within the hall our boast have raised aloft
 About the battles we should fight, the fields that we should hold—
 But now the time is come to test those who are true and bold.

I will make known my lineage and ancestry to you,
 That I was born of Mercian blood, a tribe renowned and true;
 My grandfather was Ealdhelm; a prudent man was he,
 And prosperous in worldly wise, as such a man should be.
 And never shall you censure me or visit me with blame,
 Nor thanes among this people think of me with scornful shame
 That I forsook this sad campaign or from this army fled,
 Now that my chieftain lies upon the field of battle dead.
 To me no greater loss than this could my sad fate afford,
 For he was doubly dear to me, my kinsman and my lord."
 Then forth he went, on battle bent, thinking of his dear thane,
 He drew his spear, and with it pierced one of the pirate train
 So that the pirate fell to earth by that good weapon slain.
 Then Offa spoke in words of cheer—he shook his ashen spear,
 And urged his men right onward—his friends and comrades dear:
 "Lo, now, Ælfwine, thou hast cheered our hearts in sorest need;
 For now our chieftain fallen lies, to us there is indeed
 A need that each the other cheer by act as well as word,
 As long as he can hold in hand his good spear and his sword.
 Now Godric, Odda's coward son, hath us indeed deceived;
 Thereby, that 'twas the earl himself, full many a man believed,
 When, mounted on our chief's good horse, he turned and rode away;
 Our folk were scattered in the field, our phalanx in the fray—
 Perish his deed who put to flight so many men today!"
 Leofsunu then spoke; his shield, as if for an attack,
 He raised, and said: "I will not give a single foot-length back;
 Nor shall the steadfast, taunting me, about Sturmere, say
 That when my lord all lifeless on the field of battle lay
 I journeyed lordless home and left him lying on the field;
 The sword and spear shall take me first—to them my life I yield."
 And then full angry he advanced, the field of battle sought,
 For flight he scorned, and on that field full valiantly he fought.
 Then Dunnere, an old man spoke; aloft he shook his spear,
 And called on each for Byrhtnoð's death to wreak revenge severe:
 "No one who thinks, upon this folk, t'avenge his lord's sad fate
 Will care aught for his safety now, nor can he hesitate."
 Then forward went they, nor a whit for life or safety cared;
 Their followers, too, devoted men, the battle bravely dared—
 The fierce spear-bearers prayed to God to grant it might be so
 They could avenge their dear lord's death by death among the foe.
 The hostage from Northumbria then to the rescue came—
 Of hardy race, brave Ecglaf's son, and Æscferd was his name.
 He did not falter in the fight; full oft he bent his bow—
 Sometimes his arrow struck a shield, sometimes it struck a foe.
 Ever, as long as he had strength his weapon still to wield,
 He dealt out wounds, now and anon, to foes still in the field.
 Still in the front tall Edward stood, boldly and dauntlessly;
 In boastful words he said that he would not a foot-length flee,
 That he would never make retreat while now his chieftain lay—
 Then through their wall of shields he broke, and against the foe made way
 And worthily avenged his chief upon the pirate Dane,
 Until at length he lay a corpse upon the slaughter-plain.

And so did Ætheric, his noble comrade bold and true;
 He, Sibrht's brother, bravely fought, and many others, too—
 They cleft the keel-shaped shields, they strove against the hostile throng.
 Then burst the shield-brim, and the corslet sang a woeful song.
 There, in the battle, Offa slew the pirate at a blow;
 He fell to earth, and Gadde's kinsman on the ground lay low.
 But quickly in the fight was Offa hewn down by the sword,
 And thus fulfilled what he before had promised his dear lord:
 That they should both die on the field, or home in safety ride—
 Both live, both die—and thus,thane-like, he lay his lord beside.
 Then came the crash of shields, the pirates made a fierce advance,
 And through the body of the doomed oft darted spear and lance.
 Forth then went Wistan, Thurstan's son, and fought against the Dane,
 And warriors three he slaughtered there, ere he himself was slain.
 Fierce was the fight—the men in battle firmly made their stand;
 Then fighting fell, worn out with wounds. Death fell upon the land.
 Oswold and Elwold all the while, two brothers, cheered their men,
 And bade their kinsmen-friends, hard-pressed, to hold out firmly then
 And wield their weapons manfully. Then spoke the brave Byrhtwold;
 His shield he raised, his spear he shook, and he, their comrade old,
 Exhorted then his gallant men, his language was full bold:
 "Our mind must be the bolder, our heart braver, in distress;
Our courage must grow greater as our company grows less.
 Here lies, all hewn to pieces, in the dust, our noble chief;
 And who thinks now to leave this place will surely come to grief.
 I now am old, yet, on my part, I surely will not fly—
 Here I resolve that I myself by his dear side will lie."
 And Godric, son of Æthelgar, cheered all his men in mind,
 As oft he let his battle-spear among the pirates wind—
 Not he the craven Godric, who from battle turned aside—
 So stood he in the foremost rank, and fought until he died.

WILLIAM RICE SIMS.

University of Mississippi.

OLD FRENCH INTERPRETATION.

I.

SCHELER druckt 'Berte as grans piés,' 199, 200:

"Par Sassogne s'en vinrent, par le duc Nicholai
 La duchoise estoit suer Bertain; quant j'esgardai"
 u.s.w.

Man muss bei dieser abteilung übersetzen:

"Sie (nämlich Pipins gesandte, welche die für ihren könig zur gattin bestimmte Bertha aus Ungarn abholen und Deutschland durchziehen) kamen durch Sachsen daher; durch den herzog Nicolaus war die herzogin eine schwester Berthas."

Man könnte danach allerdings denken, der herzog sei ein bruder der Bertha und die herzogin erst durch ihn eine "schwester" Ber-

thas, d.h., eine *sister-in-law*. Aber aus mehreren andern stellen des gedichts geht unwiderleglich hervor, dass Flor und Blanche-flor zu jener Zeit ausser Bertha und einem sohne, der Grodno und Polen beherrscht, nur noch eine tochter, später im gedichte mit ihrem namen Aelis, hatten, die also an den herzog von Sachsen verheiratet war. Dies richtige verwandtschaftsverhältnis erhalten wir nur durch eine starke interpunction hinter *Nicholai*, die dann auch das *enjambement* aufhebt und also den alexandriner nach altfranzösischer art correcter macht. Das *par* ist dasselbe wie 'Chevalier au lyon,' 267.

"Après me repria que gie
 Par son ostel m'an revenisse,"

oder noch besser, da es sich um eine person

handelt, eben da 554, wo Tobler *par* statt *a* einführt:

"En la fin volantez me vint,
Qu'a mon oste covant tanroie
Et que *par* lui m'an revanroie."

II.

Neben *orb* führt Diez im 'Etymolog. Wörterbuch' *dorp* an, das in keinem unserer Wörterbücher oder glossare zu finden ist und auch schon Mahn bedenkt hat, wozu wohl die Schreibung mit *p* beigetragen haben mag. Die Ansetzung von *dorp* beruht wohl auf einer falschen Auffassung einer Stelle, in der das handschriftlich überlieferte Wort als *d'orp* aufzufassen ist, wo aber auch eine Form *dorp* sein zu haben schien. Diese Stelle ist nun nach meiner Auffassung keine andere als ein Vers in dem bekannten *enueg* des Mönchs von Montaudon (Bartsch, 'Provenzal. Chrestomathie,' 134, 27-30), wo es heisst:

"et enojam per sant Marti,
trop d'aiga en petit de vi,
e quan trob escassier mati
m'enoja, e d'orp atressi."

Diez kann *dorp* recht wohl als plural aufgefasst haben: "und blinde (verdrissen mich) ebenso."

EUGEN LESER.

Berlin.

HILDEBRAND'S THEORY OF ALLITERATION.

THERE has lately appeared, in the *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, vol. v, pp. 577-85, an article entitled "Zum Wesen des Reimes auch des Stabreimes, dabei eine Berichtigung Scherers" in which Rudolf Hildebrand advances a new theory regarding the nature of the so-called Alliteration (Stabreim).

The opening remarks regarding the nature of the German 'Endreim' do not contain much that is really new. "Great stress is laid on the fact that

"Not the like sound only makes a good rime, but a combination of likeness and unlikeness, not the similarity of the vowel only is essential, but also the difference of the consonants preceding the riming vowel."

He then touches very lightly on identical and

1 See now Hildebrand himself in the January number of the *Zeitschrift*.

'rührende' rimes and their great infrequency in modern German poetry.² It seems, however, as if Hildebrand were too ready to generalize and draw from these observations far reaching conclusions regarding rime in general. It is not true that rime, wherever it appears, 'shows this quality and nature.' The beauty of rime is just as much subject to change and development, just as different among different races as any other beauty. *Ja: da: ha* are no rimes at all, according to the Arabic standard, while they are perfect rimes to our ear; on the other hand, we should not tolerate *saribu: kutabu: kusubu*, although they are perfect Arabic rimes. Cf. also the difference regarding *rimes riches* in French and German, etc.

After these preliminary remarks, Hildebrand proceeds to the discussion of the 'stabreim.' This he considers as falling entirely under the head of Rime. Only in it everything is reversed. The rime stands at the end of the word; the 'stabreim' at the beginning; in the rime the vowels are alike, the consonants differ; in the 'stabreim' the consonants are alike and the vowels differ. Consequently he rejects the term 'alliteration' as inadequately describing the phenomenon.³

This theory is, as far as I am aware, at variance

1. With the majority of writers on the subject (for example, Lachmann in 'Ersch u. Gruber') in claiming the qualitative identity of rime and alliteration;

2. With all authorities in requiring, for a perfect alliteration, a difference of vowels following the alliterating consonants (corresponding to the difference of consonants in the end-rime, of which so much was made above).

1. To settle the first point definitely seems in our present state of knowledge well-nigh impossible. However, there is much which

2 They are, however, met with more frequently than H.'s note would lead one to think. There are about a dozen instances in Goethe's smaller poems; Heine also does not avoid them, see White's ed. (Heath). For the O.G. poets see J. Grimm, *Abh. d. k. Ak. d. W.*, Berlin, 1852, p. 521 ff. — 'Kl. Schrft.', iv, 125 ff.

3 The word, by the way, was not coined as late as the last century, as H. thinks, but was used first by Joannes Jovianus Pontanus in his dialogue 'Actius,' fol. 127b ff., of the Aldine ed. of 1519.

would support Lachmann's theory of a different origin. It is not hard to imagine that the inflectional endings must, under certain conditions, cause involuntary rimes, as is the case in many Latin pentameters; for instance, *oscula pugnabit sed tamen apta dabit* (Tib., iv, 54). Of such character seem to have been the Egyptian rimes which Ebers mentions (*Z.f. Aegypt. Spr.*, xv, p. 45). Similar rimes are occasionally found in portions of the poetical books of the Old Testament. Used at first irregularly and sporadically, they are later assigned certain places in the verse and develop thus into the poetical rime, as we have it in a Semitic inscription published by Schlottmann in the *Z.d.D.M.G.*, xxxiii and xxxiv.

Such involuntary and spontaneous origin is hardly to be assumed for the 'stabreim.' The Teutonic 'stabreim,' at least, seems to be due to a conscious effort, and intended as a mnemotechnical aid, binding together a line through its most prominent words.

The rime is usually formed by the secondary and changing elements (suffixes): the 'stabreim' by the primary and stable elements (roots), often with disregard of prefixes. There are hardly any restrictions with regard to the categories of words allowed to carry the rime, while there are quite a number of such restrictions regarding the alliterating words. In the former we have an imperfect beginning (as an occasional ornament) and a gradual development; in the latter a beginning essentially perfect and a gradual decay (into a mere ornament).

2. But let us accept, for the sake of argument, Hildebrand's theory of the qualitative identity of rime and alliteration, and examine his view regarding the difference of the vowels following the alliterating consonant. However, before applying the test of 2252 lines taken at random from most alliterating poems, it is necessary to see what we reasonably may expect to find.⁴

As was said above, the number of available words for an alliterating line is much smaller than that of riming ones for two reasons:

a. Alliteration depends on roots, not suffixes.

⁴ The chief objection which can be raised against the article is, that H. has failed to examine how far his theory, evidently based on *a priori* grounds, is borne out by the facts, he being satisfied with adducing seven instances.

A very liberal deduction ought to be made on this account.

b. Alliteration can be carried only by certain words, according to fixed rules.

From these facts it appears that it is easier to construct alliterating lines where the vowels following the alliterating consonant are different, than such in which they are alike (of the vocabulary of the poet of 'Judith,' out of ninety-six words with initial *s*, only two begin with *sae*, two with *sci*, twelve with *si*, etc.). Now, then, if there really was such a rule, or even only such a tendency, to vary the vowel, we should reasonably expect very few, if any, cases of identical vowels. When Jordan wrote his 'Nibelunge' he held the common view regarding the 'stabreim,' considering only the initial consonant as essential. This poem then, I think, furnishes material very well-suited for a determination of the relative frequency of identity of vowel in alliterating words. That is to say, the percentage of such in the 'Nibelunge' may be taken as a rough average of the frequency of identical vowels, if the poet endeavours neither to introduce nor to avoid it. An examination of five hundred lines shows that somewhat over 11% of the alliterating words have identical vowels (included are the cases of the form: *xa . . . xi xa*; in all five hundred lines there were but two lines in which three alliterating words had identical vowels). Of the alliterating phrases in Latin (collected by Wölfflin, *Sitz. d. bayer. Akad.*) less than 30% (forty out of one hundred and twenty-five) have identical vowels, but a very liberal deduction must be made, because here there are no restrictions as to the words carrying the alliteration, prefixes alliterate, and there are also many cases of etymological alliteration.

It thus appears that in about 10%-15% we should find identical vowels if they are neither purposely avoided nor sought for by the poet.

Let us now look at the statistics, which are based on the following passages: Wessobrunn Prayer, 9 vss.; Hildebrand's Lay, 65 vss.; Muspilli, 100 vss.; Judith, 350 vss.; Beowulf, 784 vss. (from different parts of the poem); Heliand, 557 vss. (from different parts of the poem); Edda, 447 vss. (*Völuspá*, Baldr's Dream, Guðrun's Lay, i.).

Wessobrunn Prayer, 12%; Hildebrand's Lay, 17%; Muspilli, 28%; Judith, about 14%; Beowulf, 10%; Heliand, 20%; Völuspá, over 6%; Baldr's Dream, 8%; Guðrun's Lay, 1, 15%.

These figures go to show that in none of the poems examined did the author purposely either seek to introduce or to avoid identical vowels, but that the average percentage is such as we would expect it to be from the nature of the case, and that Hildebrand's theory, which would lead us to expect a much smaller percentage, is not sufficiently supported by facts to warrant a rejection of the old view.

There yet remains one point to be discussed. Hildebrand quotes in support of his theory a passage of Snorri Sturluson's 'Háttatal' (Hafniae, 1848, ed. Arnarn, i. 596) to the effect, that "if the höfustaf be a vowel, then the stuðlas should also be vowels and it is more beautiful if each one of them is a different vowel."

But I doubt, whether our author refers to æsthetic beauty at all, whether different vowels really caused a more pleasant sensation to his ear than identical ones. Much rather I am inclined to think, that he calls "beautiful" what he finds in the old poems, which he regards as faultless models. As is well known now, the vowel is not in such cases the alliterating element at all; but what really alliterates is the guttural explosive which precedes the formation of a vowel and is due to the opening of the vocal chords (the Greek smooth breathing, the Arabic hemza, the Hebrew aleph, etc.). We have seen, that in not more than ten to fifteen out of one hundred alliterating verses the vowels following the alliterating consonants are identical. The same, of course, will be the case with regard to the vowels following this guttural explosive; in eighty-five to ninety cases out of one hundred they will be different from each other. Sturluson knew nothing about the guttural explosive, he only saw that the different vowels at the beginning—as it seemed to him—of alliterating words were much more frequent than identical ones. Hence his conclusion that they were preferred, preferable or "more beautiful." If this be the case, his remark cannot be adduced in support of Hildebrand's theory.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.

OLD FRENCH PHONETICS.

La méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des transformations inconscientes du langage, par M. L'ABBÉ ROUSSELOT.

La Phonétique expérimentale et la philologie Franco-Provençale par M. KOSCHWITZ; contained in a reprint of the *Compte-rendu du Congrès scientifique international des catholiques*, tenu à Paris du 1^{er} au 6 avril 1891. Paris: Picard, 1891. 24 pp.

THE first of these two articles represents an address delivered by the Abbé Rousselot, co-editor with M. Gilliéron of the *Revue des Patois Gallo-Romans*, before the Catholic congress held in Paris during the month of April of last year. M. Rousselot dwells on the importance of a physical study of speech, which must form the basis of all historical study, and refers to certain mechanical appliances, invented by him and others, that register the movements which the different organs of speech undergo. This apparatus is of the most ingenious kind, and has been more fully described by M. Rousselot in the above-mentioned *Revue*, fascs. 14 and 15, where he also shows its possible application in a study of his native patois, that of Cellefrouin. Not feeling myself competent to express any definite opinion on the matter, I would refer the reader to the article in question for further information.

Dr. Koschwitz continues the same theme, and speaks of the importance of such study as that undertaken by M. Rousselot, and emphasizes the fact, that every linguist, in order to be able to cope with the problems which he will encounter, must of necessity pay attention, and a great deal of attention, to the physiology of the organs of speech, and must "d'abord se faire naturaliste, physicien et physiologiste." These methods must at first be applied to the study of living forms of speech, and the information thus gained transferred to the study of the older stages of language. This leads him to speak of the difficulty which every student of French phonology experiences, when he endeavors to compare any modern dialect with the literary language, or with older dialects. The modern patois of Northern France have undergone so marked changes in their rapidity of growth under purely phonetic influences, analogical contamination, or mixture with

surrounding forms of speech, that the aid which they afford in understanding the older forms of language, is often very meager. On the other hand the curious phenomenon is noticed, that the further we proceed toward the South of the French linguistic territory, the more do we notice a certain lack of development and a tendency to retain older forms.

It is to be supposed that the Provençal kept pace in the beginning of its history with the speech of Northern France, but that it grew less rapidly, and doubtless, therefore, we shall often find the key to unsolved problems of the linguistic history of French proper in the patois spoken to-day South of the Charente. Hence, Koschwitz lays stress on the importance of these patois for the study of French, at least in those instances where other means at our disposal, such as the study of the orthography of old texts, the assonances and the modern *Langue d'oïl* dialects fail to give the desired light. To illustrate the helpfulness of such a procedure, he cites two knotty points of Old French phonology; namely, $\tilde{l}+s$ and the history of the nasal vowels.

It is with regard to the former of these problems, that I desire to add a few remarks on the position taken by the writer. After a short historical sketch of the question, Koschwitz says, p. 16:

'On se demande quelle articulation spéciale une *l* mouillée prend devant une *s*; si elle produit nécessairement une explosive dentale entre elle et la consonne suivante; quelle influence le groupe *ls* exerce, et sur la nature des voyelles précédentes et sur l'articulation de l'*s* qui suit? Prononçait-on *s* ou *z* (*s* sonore)? Était-ce un *d* ou un *l* qu'on insérait entre *l* mouillée et *s*? Est-ce qu'une *l* mouillée suivie de *s* dégage réellement devant soi un *y* qui se réunit avec la voyelle précédente et produit avec elle une diphthongue? Et si ce dégagement (qui n'a rien d'improbable) existe en réalité, peut-il se compliquer avec une action simultanée de *l* mouillée sur la consonne suivante'?

All these questions are identical with those to which I endeavored to find an answer in my study on 'Dialectische Eigenthümlichkeiten in der Entwicklung des mouillierten *l* im Altfranzösischen,' *Publications of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION*, vol. v, pp. 52-105. It is not my purpose here to repeat what I stated there, but it may be to the point to recall that

there exists one Old French dialect, which gives unequivocal answers to some of these questions; namely, the Wallonian. Here \tilde{l} is designated by *lh*; cp. "Poème Moral" *assalhe, batalhe, mervelhe, conselhe*. The inflected forms of words with final \tilde{l} always have *lz*, never *lhs*, *lhz* or *ilz*; cp. "Dial. Greg." *travalz*, "Job," *travalz*, "Poème Moral" *travaz, conselz*. Here, there certainly exists no \tilde{l} before the flexional sign, no parasitic *i* before the *l*, and a dental glide between *l* and *s*! But far from solving the whole problem, these facts only complicate it. Each French dialect requires separate study and a distinct answer of its own. On the whole, however, I think it may be confidently asserted, that a parasitic *i* did not develop before $\tilde{l}+s$. The inflected forms naturally follow closely the orthography of the uninflected forms, and if an *i* appears before *lz*, it is either merely graphic, or if pronounced, its presence is due to a pronounced parasitic *i* in the uninflected form. In some instances it is possible to follow its gradual inroads; cp. Rol. *-alz* twenty-three times, *-ailz* five times, O. Ps. *-alz* six times, *-ailz* one time; Eul. *melz*, Al. *vielz*, *mielz*, Rol. *mielz* seventeen times, *vielz* seven times, *vieilz* five times, *mieilz* two times, O. Ps. *vielz*, *mielz*, Q.L.D.R. *vielz*.

The problem, however, which calls for solution is the appearance of *z* as flexional sign in the Norman, Champagne and Lorraine dialects. The Wallonian cannot enter here, for there *z* is found after all *l*'s. In my judgment, there lies at the root of the whole matter an understanding of the way in which a dental explosive develops between *l* and *s*. Most varieties of *l* are produced by forming a stop with the point of the tongue against the gums or teeth, while the sides of the tongue are drawn away from the molar teeth, thus creating two symmetrical channels for the sound, (Jespersen's β_{iie}). If this articulation is followed by an *s*, the spirant formed by the point, or blade, of the tongue (and for the present purpose we may accept Jespersen's transcription, $\beta_{1e} \gamma^{2}$), the tongue rests for a moment, when the *l* articulation is broken, in the position of a dental stop (βo). If the *l* is voiceless and if its articulation is sufficiently marked in muscular tension (Gröber's *l fort*, *Z.f.R.Ph.*, vi, p.

486), this dental glide may develop to an independent stop; $l+s$ becomes $l-t-s$.

In the case of $\tilde{l}+s$ on the other hand, no such conditions for the spontaneous development of a dental explosive exist. Here the stop is effected by the front of the tongue against the hard palate, while the point of the tongue rests behind the lower teeth and does not participate in the articulation ($\beta\epsilon\gamma ii^8$). Sweet, 'Handbook,' p. 44, suggests that in the first attempts to produce this difficult articulation the learner should hold the point of the tongue firmly against the lower gums, so that the front alone may articulate. From such a position the tongue can easily and naturally pass to an s without previously sounding a dental explosive, but this action does not preclude, of course, the possibility of an interposition of t between \tilde{l} and s . It is quite as easy to interpose a labial explosive; the question is merely, whether a latent dental explosive exists between $\tilde{l}+s$, as is evidently the case for $l+s$.

But we may go further, and suppose that the tongue does form a stop at the same place, where it divides the articulation for \tilde{l} , before it passes on to the dental spirant. In this case the only possible explosive is a palatal θ' , ($\beta\epsilon\gamma ii^8$ becomes γo^8). Such an articulation would have a very decided influence on the following s , and would give to it a sound, which with Chabaneau I will call "un son plus sifflant"; perhaps "plus chuintant" would be a better term. Such a supposition falls, however, if z in Old French texts denotes ts .

Now, let us see what must be the action of the tongue in passing from \tilde{l} to s . In carefully pronouncing these two sounds in succession, it will be noticed that the first movement of the tongue consists in flattening out its sides to their natural position in close proximity to the molar teeth. The s cannot be pronounced at the same point as $s+\tilde{l}$, and there will next be felt a tendency to backward action of the tongue. At the same time it will take on the requisite sagittal narrowing for the s , even before that sound is reached, and the result will be a succession of consonantal noises which may be represented by $\tilde{l}''js$. Of these, θ' will be the least prominent, and the acoustic effect of the whole combination will be very

similar to $\tilde{l}js$. So much, I think, is plain, if $\tilde{l}z$ is to be similar in formation to lz , it could only have sounded like $\tilde{l}ts$, as Chabaneau correctly supposed. Such a pronunciation, however, would have burdened the language with two plural signs, \tilde{s} and s , the existence of which is not probable. I believe that the \tilde{l} was forced to assimilate itself to the following s , since the pronunciation of this sound was fixed for morphological reasons, and \tilde{l} being thus drawn forward out of its palatal position, as voiceless and *l fort*, lz was the result.

It will be in the highest degree interesting to possess accurate physiological descriptions of the pronunciation of $\tilde{l}+s$ in the present Provençal dialects. Professor Gröber in a private communication called my attention to the orthography of the 'Donatz Proensals,' published by Stengel, Marburg, 1878. The testimony which the orthography of this document bears, seems convincing for Gröber's point of view, and against my own statement, l. c., p. 103. We find there only lhz ($=\tilde{l}+s$), lz ($=ll+s$) and ls ($=l+s$). At the same time it must be noted, however, that the rules of the Donatz were, to say the least, not followed consistently by the Provençal poets; cp. Bartsch, 'Chrest. Prov.' *foills*: *oills* 135-27: 136-29; *dezacoills*: *capdoills* 137-6: 14; *orgoills*: *escoills* 137-21: 28; *vermelhs*: *solelhs* 267-1: 2; *viels*: *miels* 392-13: 14 (and in the same poem *conselh*: *espelh* 391-11: 12). These are to my knowledge the only rhymes of this kind in the Chrestomathy. But if the 'Donatz Proensals' really represented the actual use of the writers, is it not strange that so large a collection of poems as that of Bartsch presents no rhymes in accordance with these rules?

I shall not attempt an explanation of Prov. lhz ; but, at the same time, I think it is evident that the l in the combination lz in later French was not a palatal l , for it could fall or vocalize to u , just as every other l . We have, therefore, to grant a fronting of the articulation for some stage of the history of the language; that this fronting took place in such a way that $\tilde{l}s$ became ls and then lts (lz) I consider, with Gröber, extremely improbable. I believe rather that $\tilde{l}''js$ changed to lts under the influence of the dental s , which had a fixed

pronunciation, since it was the plural sign of the language, and in this manner I desire to modify my opinion as stated, l. c., p. 103.

A priori, the Provençal can no more give definite answers to questions of French phonetics, than can the Wallonian to those of the Norman dialect; at the same time, a better understanding of all the possibilities of phonetic development and of the actual facts in the existing patois south of the Charente, must necessarily be very helpful in a consideration of general phonetic problems. I shall await with great interest some realization of the hopes of Professor Koschwitz.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

ANGLO-SAXON READER.

An Anglo-Saxon Reader, edited, with Notes and Glossary, by James W. Bright, Ph.D., Associate Professor of English Philology at the Johns Hopkins University. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1891. 12mo, pp. viii, 385.

It would be ungracious, to say the least, if the writer of this review, who for ten years has been teaching Sweet's 'Anglo-Saxon Reader,' should utter a word of disparagement about it. Sweet deserves the heartiest thanks of every one who has to do with the Philological study of English; and if now and then he has put forth bitter words,—as in the preface to his 'Oldest English Texts,'—who can deny that he has had abundant provocation? Good as his work has been, however, I am inclined to think that the best results will be obtained by our ordinary college classes here in America, if we use from the start the Cook-Sievers 'Grammar' and this new 'Reader' which Professor Bright has just presented to his colleagues. Such a combination insures thoroughness, and yet offers no sharp or sudden difficulties. The phonology in Sweet's 'Reader' is neither detailed nor exhaustive, and is distinctly difficult; and there is a crowded, abrupt fashion in his treatment of the inflections which gives needless trouble. Compare, for instance, his treatment of adjective stems,—where *ēce* is ranged quite without explanation of the reason, under the "short" declension,—with the lucid statements of Sievers.

Let these books, then, be used from the start. The primer or "beginning-book" is of doubtful benefit; a student who is ready to study Anglo-Saxon at all, is quite prepared to use the regular grammar. The time allotted to our subject in any ordinary college course is so meagre that a teacher must in most cases aim at rapid work and speedy results. A dozen paradigms and a few hints on pronunciation give the student basis for translation, which should begin at once; progress thereafter should be marked by three features:—careful translation, with grammatical analysis working gradually up to the difficulties of inflection and phonology; reading at sight; and composition. The last feature is probably neglected in most of our classes; but visitors or members of Professor Zupitza's *Seminar* at Berlin will recollect how much stress is laid by that admirable teacher upon a facility of translating from the vernacular. Passages are given in German to be translated immediately into Anglo-Saxon,—a discipline of evident value. Indeed, a booklet of materials for such exercises would be a goodly offering for some one to make to his profession: not, of course, that we could expect the young lions of original research to hunt this ignoble quarry, but peradventure there be humbler who have borne the burden of instruction and are willing to minister to the lower needs.

To come closer to the subject of this review, I believe that Professor Bright's book will forward the study of Anglo-Saxon in general, and will be a friend and aider of those who would have modern English kept in communication with its chief and proudest sources. For while the university teacher may look forward to a doctor's degree for his pupil, and may insist upon a thorough knowledge of every inch of ground in the field of Old-English philology, it is the problem of teachers in the ordinary American college how they shall make most profitable to the student the hour or two weekly, for perhaps a single year, which he devotes to this study. We tell such a student that his brief course in Anglo-Saxon is not an "intellectual luxury," but rather an almost necessary condition of appreciation in his estimate of English history, English literature and the English tongue. To read in the

original King Alfred's preface to the translation of Gregory's 'Pastoral Care' is to come closer to the heart of English patriotism, to get a deeper insight into the meaning of Germanic supremacy in modern history, than could be done by reading volumes of ordinary comment. The 'Battle of Maldon' is itself a liberal education. We owe thanks to Professor Bright for retaining these and other favorites, and for resisting the temptation to seek a flavor of originality by pushing the claims of new candidates. The additions, however, are good,—particularly the "Conversion of Edwin." With regard to verse, the "Phœnix" is properly chosen; though I am bound to confess some lack of appreciation for its much praised grace and beauty. It is well that no extract is given from the 'Béowulf': though I should have been glad to find the passage of 'Exodus' (Grein, vii,=vv. 446-515), which describes in such true Germanic fashion the ruin of the Egyptian host, and contains the most nervous metaphor in the whole range of our early poetry:

.... *rodor swiþode*
meredéaða mæst....

By the way, has no comparing soul, such as are so busy in these latter days, hit upon the parallel between this famous picture of ocean raging like an angry warrior,—

gársecg wêdde,
up átēah, on slēap....
fāmigbōsma flōdwearde slōh
unhlēowan wæg alde mēce....

and the pulsing rhythm of Swinburne's chorus in 'Erechtheus,' where a battle on land and the onrush of a flooding ocean are described in absolutely interpenetrating allegory? Take such phrases as "the lips of the rearing breaker with froth of the manslaying flood"; "the terror and thunder of water that slays as it dies"; or these lines:

"And the meadows are cumbered with shipwreck of chariots
that founder on land,
And the horsemen are broken with breach as of breakers,
and scattered as sand....
And the clang of the sharp shrill brass through the burst of
the wave as it shocks,
Rings clean as the clear wind's cry through the roar of the
surge on the rocks".....

How like they are, and how different; and

what a pretty study in the evolution of poetical style! The omission of an extract from the 'Béowulf' is good, for the simple reason that the 'Béowulf' should always be read as a whole. True, if there is a chance to read the 'Elene,' say, between the 'Reader' and the 'Béowulf,' good; but if time is limited, let the student dash manfully into the churning breakers of our old epos, with all the spirit of Leibnitz's maxim that to the enthusiast hard things are easy and easy things are hard. It is manslaughter to drag a class through the 'Elene,' if no compensation follow in the shape of the 'Béowulf.' Even in longer courses and with ample leisure, a very small portion of those half-childish paraphrases will suffice. 'Widsið' is supremely interesting for its incidental relations; 'Déor' justifies itself; the 'Wanderer' and the 'Seafarer' and the 'Ruin' are preliminary studies to the 'Poema Morale' or Gray's more famous poem, and are amply worth our reiterated study; 'Maldon' and 'Brunanburh' belong with 'Chevy Chase' and 'Agincourt'; but, saving magnificent 'Judith' and a few passages like that from the 'Exodus,' these biblical paraphrases, and the other religious poems, with their incongruous mingling of battle-music and nursery-hymns, remind us of some heavily armed and sword-clanking dragoon pushing a perambulator.

While Professor Bright has thus given us a sort of anthology, he has not lost sight of his prime intention; he has kept his eye upon the needs of the student of Anglo-Saxon in and for itself. In this regard, text and notes, excellently done, are supplemented by a careful glossary; this has been a weak side of previous Readers, but is here worked out with obvious care. References are given to the various forms of a word, and case or tense is specified. An appendix contains Lactantius *de Ave Phœnice*,—a capital chance for the student to contrast not only the style and syntax of Latin and early English, but to institute more elaborate and detailed comparisons. Appendix ii, on Anglo-Saxon versification, is a careful and welcome summary of the conclusions reached by Sievers in his well-known investigations. A third appendix, with brief account of Anglo-Saxon poetical style, the kennings and parallelisms, would have been

useful. Moreover, it seems here and there that the notes are too scanty; not in the way of translation or grammatical comment, but in the matter of facts and historical or antiquarian interests. For example, the dramatic story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard is of great interest for its incidental description of an Anglo-Saxon house; references to Tacitus and other early Germanic sources, with a quotation or two from authorities not accessible even to the main body of teachers, would be helpful indeed. Still, we must not ask the maker of such a book to ride all these hobbies; and we are reminded that a teacher is grateful nowadays if the text-book leaves him any chance to impart a fresh bit of knowledge.

I have had neither time nor inclination for mere error-hunting; and, indeed, the English reviewer in the *Academy* brought back little from his quest. Treasure trove of this somewhat ungracious sort should be collected by teachers who use the book and put it to a true test, and are willing to send their discoveries and suggestions directly to the author. This the present reviewer promises to do. Meanwhile, it is ground for congratulation among teachers that a student of English philology may begin his work with such a text-book, and may feel from the start the guidance of good taste and sound scholarship.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

La Perle Noire par Victorien Sardou and *Le Voyage autour de ma Chambre* par Xavier de Maistre: Edited with Lives of the Authors, Vocabulary, Notes and Composition Exercises by J. SQUAIR, B. A., Lecturer in French in University College, Toronto, and J. MACGILLVRAV, Ph.D., Professor of Modern Languages, Queen's College, Kingston. Toronto: W. J. Gage & Co., 1891. xi, 322 pp.

EDUCATIONAL authorities in Canada, evidently in the effort to bring some uniformity into the requirements in modern languages for admission to the universities, have prescribed these two works for what they term "the High School Leaving and University Matriculation Examination." The present edition has been

prepared in response to that requirement and annotated with special reference to it. It is a neat little volume, in good clear type, containing, besides the text, short biographical sketches of the authors, a good vocabulary, ample notes and a valuable and instructive set of composition exercises based on the idioms in the texts.

The selection of these two texts for the University Matriculation Examination is, no doubt, a happy one, since both are fine specimens of later French prose, clear and pure in style and well adapted, especially the narrative version of '*La Perle Noire*,' to the practical study of the language by those who have already had some training in French. The editors have done their work well. The biographical sketches are good, but we venture the suggestion that they are too short. De Maistre gets two small pages, Sardou five. Even beginners, and certainly High School students and incoming University men, would appreciate and profit by a more extended account of the literary character and importance of the authors. The notes are quite elementary and well suited to the needs of beginners, except in that they often give more help—especially by translating too much—than is necessary or advisable even for beginners. Students advanced enough to attempt these texts at all do not need to have words and phrases like *plus vite*, *malheureusement*, *la foudre est tombée*, *bonnes à rien*, *deux fois par jour*, *sans laisser trace*, *sans encombre*, *il faut qu'il ait*, *et tout me dire*, etc., translated for them in the notes, or to be told that *tu*, *toi*, etc., are used in familiar address. A large number of omissions, discovered unfortunately too late, have rendered the "Addenda to Vocabulary" necessary and the texts still contain a good many words not found in either Vocabulary or Addenda.

The "composition exercises" are an interesting and valuable addition. The editors have picked out the idioms and peculiar expressions occurring in each page of the texts, and, with slight changes, have skillfully wrought them into eight or ten English sentences for re-translation into French. These exercises, if written at intervals as the student progresses through the text, cannot fail to be of much

practical assistance in mastering the difficult subject of French idioms and, in the hands of a competent teacher, they will do good service as a basis for conversational exercises.

WALLER DEERING.

Vanderbilt University.

FRENCH COMPOUNDS.

Ueber re- und ré- im Französischen von MAX SOHRAUER.*

THE new material made available by the appearance of Sachs' 'Französisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch' led the author to a fresh attempt at fixing the rules under which the Latin prefix RE becomes *re-* or *ré-* in French. A number of writers besides Diez, Darmesteter and Mätzner had treated the subject, notably E. Gerlach (Herrig's *Archiv*, lxxvii, 201-208), whose article Sohrauer names as the basis of his own. Besides arranging the results already obtained, the author has taken a long step toward the final clearing up of the question by explaining the present confusing variations in the accentuation and pronunciation of the particle, as the result of a struggle between conflicting literary and popular usages. As his conclusions cannot fail to be of value to all who have to do with French as written, they are here given somewhat in full.

The Latin form RED appears in French in a few learned words and always as *réd*, except in *redonder* and derivatives (*rédonder* also found).

The prefix appears in composition mostly with verbs; for substantives, a convenient rule is that of Gerlach—in dissyllables *re-* bears no accent. The exceptions are: *récent*, *récit*, *rétus*, *réchaud*, *réduit*, *rédam*, *réfect*. *Réchauf* should be added. In composition with verbs, *re-* appears with open *e* (é), close *e* (è), and with the neutral vowel, or *e* "mute" (ê).

1. *Ré-* appears in closed syllables and bears no accent. All consonant groups close the syllable, except mute+liquid; *ss* (save in *ressayer*, *ressuyer* [also é], *ressusciter* [also é] with their derivatives); *sc* in *resceller*, *rescousse* (é also è); *st* in *restagnation*, *restipuler*.

**Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, lxxv. Band, 1. Heft, p. 29.

2. The boundaries between *ré-* (é) and *re-* (è), which appear in open syllables, are more difficult to fix. Here is imperative the separation of learned words from popular words, including under the latter head words inherited from the Folk Latin vocabulary, words of French popular origin, and learned words which have been taken into, and undergone the influences of, the popular speech.

a. In compounds of *re*+vowel, this division is easily made. Popular: (*e* elided) *rabaïsser*, *remplir*, *réchapper*, *rissir* (old), *roffrir*, *rhabiller*. Learned: *réadopter*, *ré-exporter*, *rééditer*, *réimporter*, *réoccuper*, *ré-unir*, *réhabiliter*. Two forms are often recognized: *rappeler*—*réappeler*, *rembarquer*—*ré-embarquer*, *répouser*—*réépouser* (E. About), *rhâbituer*—*réhabituer*, etc. Note also the following double forms, with or without difference of meaning: *rémourdre* (=re+émourdre) and *remourdre* (=re+mourdre). So *récrier* (=re+écrier), *répousseter*, *réteindre*, *réchampir*, *réventer*, by the side of *recrier* (=re+crier), *repouster*, etc. Note also *régayer*—*regayer*, *rémailler*—*remailler*.

b. In *re*+single consonant (mute+liquid, *ss*) apparent disorder reigns. The author, however, shows that *ré-* is to be expected in words of learned origin and *re-* in those of popular origin. Popular: *recevoir*, *refuser*, *recueillir*, *rechercher*, *repentir*, *reposer*, *retenir*, etc., etc. Learned: *recupérer*, *rediger*, *référer*, *réconcilier*, *réclamer*, *réfuter*, etc., etc. It may be added that this conflict between the learned and popular pronunciations of the particle, appears early. At the time of the enrichment of the language in the sixteenth century, the *savants*, in making new words on Latin or Greek models, wrote *ré-* as well as *dé-* and *pré-*,¹ probably under the influence of the Latin pronunciation of the schools,² or by analogy to *é* in the common prefix *res-* (=re+ex, etc.). At the same time the popular usage was to pronounce *re*,³ a usage which seems to have remained unchanged to our day, as it is in full life in popular speech at the present time.⁴ The popular usage has, more-

¹ Thurot, 'De la Prononciation Française,' i., 113.

² *Ibid.* Introd., xci, ff.

³ Thurot, i, 137. ⁴ Agnel, 'De l'Influence du Langage Populaire,' etc., p. 2 ff.

over, superseded the former literary usage, and to-day *ré-* is not written in new formations by the literary class, except in compounds of *re*+vowel thus: *réagenouiller*, *réemboîter*, *réinventer*, *réorganiser*, but *rebannir*, *recalculer*, *reclasser*, *retraverser*; *s* *réarrêter*, *réadmettre*, but *repourvoir*, *retaxer*, *retransférer* (Littré: Supplément).

From this long-continued opposition of the literary and popular usages, the author explains:

First: the following (complete) list of double forms: *récompenser*—*recompenser*, and *récréer*, *réfléchir*, *réformer*, *réparer*, *répartir*, *résigner*, *résonner*, *réprouver*, by the side of *re-* *créer*, *réfléchir*, etc. In these forms it is of practical importance to note that in all the compounds with *re-* the particle has *é*, and expresses simple repetition of the action of the *simplex*; while the learned forms with *ré-* show derived meanings. (*Refléchir*='fléchir de nouveau'; *réfléchir*='ponder'; etc.).

Secondly: the presence of *re* in learned forms by analogy to the popular usage: *registrer* (but *régistration*), *rebeller* (but *rébellion*), *relegation*, *relation*, *reliques*, etc.⁶ In secondary compounds, *é* often goes to *è*: *religion*—*irreligion*, *reprochable*—*irréprochable*, *relation*—*corrélation*.

Evidently, therefore, for the *re-* compounds discussed under *b*, no principle can be given beyond the general rule of separation of learned from popular forms. For students who cannot make this distinction, as the author says, "gedächtnismässige Übung" is the only resource.

c. Old French *res*+cons. appears in the modern language, with few exceptions, as *ré*+cons. (always *é* except *retable* [*è*] *retreindre* [*è*]:—*répit* (O. Fr. *respit*) *récrire* (O. Fr. *rescrire*) *réveiller* (O. Fr. *resveiller*), etc.

In compounds of *re*+*s*+vowel, some difficulties arise:

⁵ Darmesteter, 'De la Création Actuelle de Mots Nouveaux dans la Langue Française,' etc., p. 141.

⁶ Thurot, i, p. 114 ff., gives a considerable list of words in which usage formerly hesitated between the learned and popular forms. *Réserver* (Bouhours, 1694); *reserver* (Richelet, 1680); Andry (1689) gives *résoudre* and *resoudre*; and many others. These variations in accentuation mostly came to an end on the appearance of the Dictionary of the Academy in 1740.

1. *Ress-* has *é* in all words, except *ressayer*, *ressuyer*, and *ressusciter* with their derivatives;

2. Double forms as *resaigner*—*ressaigner*, *ressouffler*—*ressouffler*, *resécher*—*ressécher*, etc.

1. The *é* (or *è*) in *ressayer*, *ressuyer*, the author correctly traces to the initial *é* (or *è*) in *es-* (*ressayer*=*re*+*essayer*, *ressuyer*=*re*+*es-suyer*). The same explanation is advanced for *ressusciter*, but the necessary **essusciter* is not known in Old French, while *susciter* and *resusciter* occur frequently. The word has been used in popular speech, as its *ss* shows, and the avoidance of *é* (a mid-mixed-wide vowel) is perhaps to be explained by the strong high-front-narrow group *-susc-* which follows.

2. The author distinguishes the forms with *ss* as "französische Bildungen," and as of learned origin forms such as *résister*, *résoudre*. He also notes that the latter have always the voiced *s* (=z), except in *réséquer*, *résection*. No explanation, however, is advanced for the occurrence of the same form with *s* and *ss*.

It appears that here also is a case of opposing usages in the literary and popular speech as early as the sixteenth century. Among the people, in compounds of *re*+*s*+vowel, the feeling that the word was composite caused the formerly initial *s* to remain voiceless, even when thus intervocal, while in the learned usage, this *s* was voiced.⁷ In popular forms which earned the recognition of the *savants*, the voiceless *s* was denoted by *ss*.⁸ Coming to our own day, in new compounds the *s* is treated as other single consonants by literary writers, and is not doubled, but at the same time retains its own sound: *resiffler*, *resigner*, *resonner*, *resouper*, *resubdiviser*. The forms with *rés*, (=rez) are, however, so numerous that the orthographic designation of the voiceless *s* (by *ss*) is still felt to be needed. In a number of cases the double forms exist: *reseller*—*resseller*, *resaluer*—*ressaluer*, *resangler*—*ressangler*, *resemer*—*ressemer*, etc. In other cases only the form with *ss* exists, an indication of popular origin or use: *ressaisir*, *ressauter*, *ressembler*, *resserrer*, *ressortir*, *ressouvenir*, etc.

⁷ Thurot ii, 219.

⁸ *Ibid.* ii, 386, quoting Cauchie (1575).

Lastly, it may be noted that the popular pronunciation of *re*+*s*+vowel (= *res*) has apparently invaded the territory of the vowel in closed syllable, in *resatuation*, *restipuler*. The further examples given by the author—*resceller* and *rescousse* (*e*, *ε*) are only apparent exceptions to the rule of *ε* in closed syllable. In *resceller*, *sc*=*s*, the syllable is not closed, and the case does not differ from those in the last paragraph. *Rescinder* and derivatives are rather to be adduced as exceptional, as we should expect *ε*. *Rescousse* (*rɛk*- and *rɛsk*-) is an apparent exception only, as we have *ε* only when *s* is silent; when *s* is heard, *ε* regularly appears.

It is unfortunate that what is perhaps the latest utterance on this subject—that of Koschwitz, in his 'Grammatik der Neufranzösischen Schriftsprache,' i. (Berlin: 1889)—should be so expressed as to be misleading in at least two respects. He says (p. 25):

"Nach ihnen [that is, Old French *des*, *res*, *tres* before Cons.] richteten sich *dés* vor Vokal, und *dé*, *ré* . . . die im Laufe der Zeit immer mehr altem *de*, *re* mit dumpfem *e* Konkurrenz machen, in Neubildungen mit *de* fast ausschliesslich herrschen, und auch bei *re*, wenn es nicht iterativ gesetzt wird."

The very natural interpretation of this sentence, namely, that *ré*- is used in new formations at the present day (*Neubildungen*) except when the particle is iterative, in which case *re*- is used—would be wrong in view of the facts. In the present literary usage *re*- may be prefixed with iterative force to any verb whose action is capable of repetition; in these cases the form *re*- is used (except before vowels): *redéployer*, *redébattre*, *recarboniser*, etc. As seen above, new (literary) compounds with a *simplex* beginning with a vowel, the form *ré*- is used, and here, again, the prefix is purely iterative. Outside of these cases, new compounds with *ré*- are extremely rare, and the accent is usually traceable to related forms, as *réflecter* made from *réflecteur* (Littré: 'Supplément').

Prof. Koschwitz evidently intended to restate Sohrauer's principle that the form *ré*- had a strong life during the period of enrichment and may be expected in words of learned origin, while *re*-, oftenest with iterative force, is to be expected in words of popular origin.

But it must be noted that in the popular speech *re*- has been used as a prefix with no less than six different significations besides that of iteration (*nicht iterativ*), usages which have left numerous and important traces in the language.⁹ To cite examples of only one of these, that of compounds in which the prefix apparently adds nothing to the meaning of the *simplex*: *remercier*, *reluquer*, *renifler*, *remonter*; and *receler*, *reconforter*, *remontre*, given by Thierry (1564).¹⁰

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PLAY OF THE WEAVERS OF COVENTRY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I have read with great interest a notice by Prof. Davidson, in the March issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES, in which he calls attention to the fact that certain parts of the play of the Weavers of Coventry and of the twentieth York play are the same. This is but another of a number of similar instances made known of late years which prove that the Old English Mystery Plays we possess did not all originate independently, but that comparatively many of them, either as a whole or in part, were imitated or copied from some of the others. As an accurate knowledge of the extent and character of these relations is important for the determination of the origin and development of the religious drama in England, every new instance of this kind must needs be of great interest to students of this special subject.

For this reason I hope that Prof. Davidson will not content himself with so brief a notice of his discovery. Further details are especially desirable in this case; for as far as my knowledge and experience go, it is not very easy to get access to copies of the Weavers' play. This play was privately printed in 1846 in Edinburgh for the Abbotsford Club, and I did not succeed, for instance, in tracing a

⁹ Darmesteter, 'Formation,' p. 99; 'Création,' p. 141; Agmel, op. cit.

¹⁰ Quoted by Darmst., 'Formation,' p. 97.

single copy of it in Germany. There is a copy of it in the British Museum (press-märk: Ac 8247 2), and while in London some three years ago, I began copying it with a view of comparing it with the other extant plays on the same subject, but as my time was very limited, and as the play turned out to be much longer than I had expected (about 1250 lines), I could copy only a very small portion of it, not including the part Prof. Davidson refers to.

I compared, however, the whole play with the corresponding two plays, xviii ("Purification") and xx ("Christ Disputing in the Temple,"), of the 'Ludus Coventriae'—of which the Weavers' play does not form a part—and can say that they are entirely independent of one another.

If on the other hand, as Prof. Davidson has found, parts of the Weavers' play agree with parts of the twentieth York play, the question as to their mutual relation may easily become more complicated than it might seem to be at first sight; for some portions of the York play occur almost word for word in the corresponding plays, both of the Towneley and of the Chester collections, as I have shown in *Anglia*, vol. xi, p. 260 ff. In case these parts should happen to be the same as the "sixteen stanzas of the York play," mentioned by Prof. Davidson, there would be no less than four parallel versions of the same original play or part of a play; and even if we take it for granted that the York play in its primitive form was the original version, the question remains to be answered whether the other three were directly taken from the York play, or partly from each other.

Furthermore, in carefully reading the Weavers' play, my attention was especially attracted, in the part preceding the "Presentation in the Temple" proper, by two scenes between Mary and Joseph, very similar to each other. Both of these scenes represent husband and wife as indulging in one of those conjugal quarrels so common on the medieval stage, and in both instances Joseph addresses the audience, complaining of the trials of married life and pronouncing happy those that have been wise enough to remain single. These scenes seemed to me, at the time, to agree very closely with a similar one in one of the plays of either

York, Chester, or Towneley, but I was unable to carry the investigation any further, and am now not in possession of all the necessary material for taking it up again.

In short, it seems to me that the relations of the Weavers' play to the twentieth York play, and possibly to the other plays on the same subject (with exception, however, of Coventry xviii and xx), are important enough to warrant a more detailed investigation; while on the other hand, the interesting notice of Prof. Davidson will be of but little profit to most scholars, unless at least the corresponding parts of the two plays be printed. My object then in writing these lines is to call attention to these two circumstances, and I hope that either Prof. Davidson or some one else who has access to the Abbotsford Club print of the Weavers' play, will soon give us the needed details.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

ANGLO-SAXON PHONOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Permit me a few words suggested by the remarks of Professor Hempl in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 251. It is well known that initial *h* was very weak in the North, and so might not possess consonantal value when brought into the medial position as proposed. But how much stronger was it in Mercian?

Compare with the list given by Bouterwek (p. cxl), and with Lindelöf ('Sprache d. Rit. v. Durham,' §44; s. also the *Nation*, lii, 72) the following words which occur in R¹:

Initial *h* is wanting in: *is* (ejus) 7. 24; 22. 24; 24. 46; *us* 17. 25; *eard* 25. 24; *eorta* 6. 21; *-um* 18. 35; *eora* 6. 15 etc. (9); *eo* (hēo) 16. 18; *æfdon* 8. 33; *æfð* 13. 12; (cf. *æbbe*, Charters 48. 19); *ge-yrdon* 19. 25; *yngrade* 25. 35; (of less significance, the foreign words *erodes* 2. 1; *ymne* 26. 30).

Inorganic *h* appears in: *heow* (vobis) 6. 14; *hōehtnisse* 5. 10 *hoehtende* 5. 12; *hehtende* 5. 11; *his* (est) 3. 3; 5. 3; 17. 4; 22. 20; *hoð* 5. 34. 36; *a-e* 26. 72; *-as* 5. 33; *hefalsap* 9. 3; *-adum* 27. 39; *hefalsunge* 15. 19. I omit, as less important, the frequent cases where *h* is inorganic, or wanting, before consonants. For the 'V. Ps.,' cf. Zeuner, p. 84; for 'Corpus,' Dieter, p. 66.

Now strong medial or final *h* did not always effect *eo* in Mercian. Shall it be assumed, then, that weak initial *h*, brought into the medial position, changed *eo* to *e* persistently in the case in question?

A careful statistical analysis of the language of the "Durham Book" is still wanting, and we cannot speak with certainty about it. But it passes for an independent dialect. Are we at liberty, therefore, to speak of doublets in such a dialect as "no stranger" than in a dialect known to be mixed, like that of Chaucer, still less modern English?

Again *geoc* should not be adduced to show the probability of *geo*-forms (from *ju*-) in the North since it represents W.Gc. *jo*- (cf. Sievers, §74; Cosijn, p. 70). It has gone a different road from *ging*, *gigod*. Yet even in this very word the tendency against "palatal influence" in North. and Merc. may be plainly seen. The Durham Rit. has *iocce* (cf. Lindelöf, p. 24), and R₁ has only *ioc* II. 29. 30.

The only remains of Old North. that we possess, aside from a few inscriptions, are the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual. If no genuine case of *geo*- (= *ju*-) can be found in these texts, it can only be assumed without evidence that such forms existed. The special peculiarity for North. is *gi*- (= *ju*-), cf. *gigod* etc., a change which Lindelöf confesses is not clear to him. On the other hand, Mercian keeps *iu*-, *gu*- unchanged (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 251). This appears to be a characteristic difference in dialect.

EDWARD M. BROWN.

University of Cincinnati.

FURTHER NOTES TO PARIS'S 'EXTRAITS DE LA CHANSON DE ROLAND.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—To Professor Sheldon's article entitled "A Few Notes on Old French Phonology" in the March number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, I venture to add a statement of some of the difficulties encountered by the student in the use of Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland.'

In the 'avertissement' we are told that

"Un exercice très utile pour les étudiants sera de contrôler toutes les étymologies et d'expliquer toutes les formes qui s'y trouvent à l'aide des règles de phonétique et de flexion données dans les observations grammaticales."

The author's plan of tracing the phonetic changes backward from the French form to the Latin, involves the disadvantage of leaving unexplained those sounds in the Latin etymon that have disappeared in the course of development. While the student may find an explanation of all the sounds in *païens*, *chedables* and *quinze*, he is compelled to consult other treatises in order to learn under what conditions the *g* in PAGANUS, the *ð* in *CATABOLUM, and the *d* in QUINDECIM have disappeared. A few pages devoted to general rules for the development of the word from the Latin starting-point, would satisfy what seems to be a real need.

In the table of the "Valeur phonétique des caractères employés," we find:

ð.—o ouvert ou bref (*sotte*, *port*).

ó.—o fermé ou long (*sot*, *côte*).

In the examples here given, the *o* of *port*, on the contrary, is *ouvert long*, and that of *sot* is at least not *fermé long* (it is "*fermé moyen*" in the "Tableau figuratif" of the new French dictionary of Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, p. xxvi).—According to §9, ILLAC would give *lai*, but *la* is the form occurring in the text (II. 16, 24, 168).—The nom. pl. of the definite article *li* (ILLI) is explained in §18, but the exceptional development of the nom. sing. *li* is not.—In §27 *guascoigne* and *guascoing* are cited as examples of the formation of the diphthong *oi* from *o*, while in §55 *ign* and *ing* (final) are noted as the graphic representations of *ñ*.—It is stated in §28 that the diphthong *ou* "provient de *ō*, ñ plus *u* (*lou*, *dous*, *dessoure*)," but in the case of *dessoure*, in which *soure* comes from *sovre* (*sobra*, *sopra*), neither the development of *v* from *p* (cf. §42), nor that of *u* from *v* (cf. §29) is given.—The statement in §52 that Latin *rr* persists does not apply to *rr*, become final: *turris*, *tors*, l. 3 (see Bourciez, 'Phonétique française' §§171, 1 and 172, 1).—In the case of *quinze* (§56, l. 6) a reference to §46, l. 10 (*z*=voiced *s*) would be of assistance.—The rule for *dž* from *d* medial + *j* (VIRIDIARIUM, *vergier*) is omitted in §58.—It is nowhere

made clear why the development of the tonic vowel in Ger. SCAC, *eschac* should have differed from that of Arabic SCHAH, *eschàs*.—No explanation is given of the *e* in the final syllable of *furent* (v. 12) and other 3d pl. pret. forms.—The development of initial Germanic *hr* to *r* (HRODLAND, *Roðlant*) is also unmentioned.—The explanation of the nasal *e* (p. 7, l. 3) does not cover the case of the preposition *en* (IN).—The origin of the dative-genitive case-form of the per. pronoun *lui* is unexplained.—The use of *si* in the sense of *et* (to mark the transition), as in verses 391, 395, 500, 504, 697, etc., is not indicated in the vocabulary.—In giving the etymology of *vieil*, the hypothetical form *VECULUM* is not mentioned.

The following errata have been noted:

Page xii, note, read 1 for 4.

- " 5, l. 19, " *peðre* for *pedre*.
- " 5, " 23, " *qued* for *qued*.
- " 14, " 7, " §§ 56, 57 for §§ 55, 56.
- " 17, " 2, " *mots* for *mois*.
- " 25, " 23, " *empereðor* for *enpereðor*.
- " 50, " 10, " 219 for 220.
- " 61, " 8, " 762 " 772.
- " 65, v. 1, " *e* " *et*.
- " 85, (caption) read 1680-1850 for 1600-1850.
- " 114, insert as caption (Vers 3705-3733-).
- " 117, col. 2, l. 8, read 455 for 454.
- " 124, " 2, " 8, " 65 for 64.
- " 135, " 2, read *fesistes* for *fesist*.
- " 138, under (Hardement), read *hardemenz* for *hardement*.
- " 151, " 4. *Que*, read *qued* for *qued*.
- " 157, " *Tens* " 416 for 116.
- " 158, " *Umele* " *HŮMĪLEM* for *HŮMĪLEM*.

E. L. RICHARDSON.

Leland Stanford Junior Univ.

A CONTESTED POINT IN THE INTERPRETATION OF TENNYSON'S "IN MEMORIAM."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The allusion in the first stanza of Tennyson's "In Memoriam"—I speak of the poem proper, not of the Prologue—has been the subject of prolonged controversy among

Tennyson students and interpreters, in both England and America. It has been frequently explained as having reference to a familiar passage in Longfellow's "Ladder of Saint Augustine," and it is interpreted in accordance with this somewhat arbitrary conjecture by Morley in his 'Library of English Literature,' under "Poems of Religion." The impossibility of reconciling with certainty the respective dates of composition should exclude this supposition as unsustained by rational proof, and unscientific in its mode of seeking for the truth.

The question has been definitely settled, however, by Lord Tennyson himself, who in a brief but explicit letter to the writer, dated November 3d, 1891, says that the allusion is to Goethe, and refers to one of his latest utterances,—'From changes to higher changes',—as the suggestion or inspiration of this renowned stanza which has become engrafted into the very consciousness of English speech.

In the most recent edition of Bartlett's 'Dictionary of Poetical Quotations', the student will find Lord Tennyson's own comments upon the passage as expressed or conveyed to Dr. Gatty, the well-known author of a 'Key to In Memoriam.' The Poet Laureate regards the stanza in question as embodying and setting forth the very essence of Goethe's philosophic creed.

HENRY E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston.

INTRODUCTION TO PHONETICS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—There are a few points in Prof. Grandgent's very favourable review of my 'Introduction to Phonetics' in your February number, 1892, to which, with your permission, I should be glad to reply. The most important of these is the alleged stiffness of my English pronunciation, said to be "stiff almost to pedantry." Certainly, if I had not explained that I had judged it most convenient to use fixed forms for variable and weak words (p. 84), the pronunciation represented would be more than stiff, indeed quite impossible. It is only on p. 82 of Part ii, that I have given a specimen showing my pronunciation of weak and variable

words, but I hoped that I had guarded against misconception, for I have not only discussed these words pretty fully on pp. 76-85, but have expressly stated that

"To pronounce such (that is, weak) words always in their emphatic forms would be very strong and unnatural, and quite contrary to the genius of our language. In fact no Englishman could do it."

P. 78; see also p. 106. But as children and beginners in phonetics find it extremely difficult to analyse whole sentences and to write down correctly the weak forms of variable words (pp. 107 f.) I aimed at a style of writing which they could adopt without attempting this analysis, by simply spelling one word at a time.

In French such a method of spelling would be practicable, and Mr. Paul Passy is responsible for the French specimens. In like manner, Prof. Viator is answerable for the German, where he has introduced the glottal stops less regularly in the more colloquial passages.

That long 'æ' is often heard in English I cannot deny. Long wide 'ɔ,' as in *dog*, is also not infrequent, but I think that both are inelegant and ought to be avoided.

Prof. Grandgent concludes that because I pronounce *fairest* like *aorist*, there is a strong glide before the 'r' in both cases. On the contrary, there is no appreciable glide in either. See pp. 59, 60. And in the same way I pronounce simple 'ɔ' and not 'ɔə' before 'r' followed by a vowel, as in *story*. *Transition* I pronounce not with 'z,' but with 's.'

Laura Soames.

Brighton, England.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—I would remind Miss Soames that I objected, not to any "alleged stiffness" in her own pronunciation, nor even to the "more than stiff" English of her texts, but to the discrepancy between her English and French systems of notation. I cannot see why the argument she adduces for English does not apply with equal force to the other language. However, I do not think it worth while to discuss at greater length what seems to me to be, at the worst, a slight blemish in an excellent book.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Rather extensive personal observation and the examination of a large number of catalogues for the studies pursued at different colleges, have led the writer to conclude that the study of the Romance languages and especially literatures, is much neglected if not lightly esteemed in many institutions. An investigation of the facts which should clearly set forth the condition (amount, character, etc., so far as possible) of the study of these idioms and the wider circulation of the same, would be interesting and instructive, and could not fail to do much toward correcting the want of appreciation in which these studies are held in certain parts of our country. It does not seem improbable that the chief cause of the wide-spread neglect of these subjects, is the result of ignorance of their real value as a means of discipline, and of the extent, wealth and charm of their literatures.

Students are often less to blame for their neglect of these subjects than are persons, who have the shaping of their courses of study before they reach the time when these idioms are taken up. A carefully prepared lecture by the professor of Romance languages, or some equally qualified person, giving general notions of the wealth of the Romance tongues and of the importance of the Latin races, might contribute to arouse an interest in students whose attention had not before been called to these studies. As one of the most reliable and helpful aids to a presentation of the subject in outline, will be found a series of books on 'Zeiten, Völker und Menschen,' von Karl Hillebrand (Strassburg, Verlag von Trübner). 'Frankreich und die Franzosen' is now before me, and has been found to be a mine of information and suggestion.

EUGENE W. MANNING.

De Pauw University.

BRIEF MENTION.

Part iv, Section i (*sār—swīðrian*) of the Bosworth-Toller 'Anglo-Saxon Dictionary' (Clarendon Press), just published, will disappoint students of Anglo-Saxon who have long

been looking for the completion of this work. Professor Toller had not prepared his public for a division of Part iv, and his silence on the point begets the unpleasant apprehension that the tattered parts, now extending over ten years, are not soon to be patched and glued into the desired whole. The low speed at which Professor Toller is proceeding in this work would be less annoying if the reason for it were more obvious. In the new pages the editor maintains his previous level of workmanship. The articles on the dem. *sē*, the verb *sculan*, the particle *swā*, and the pron. *self* are very full and of special value for syntax, while editorial skill is specially prominent in the classification of meanings under *scēawian*, *scēotan*, *sēcan*, *secgan*, *sellan*, *settan*, *slēan*, *standan*. Under *seolh*, *sulh* and *sūlung* the editor disregards the compensative lengthening of vowels (Sievers, §218). The peculiar use of *selfice* occurring 'Past.' 25, 7 is omitted, but excellent discrimination is shown in admitting the new theme *scofettan*.

An interesting and suggestive 12mo pamphlet of sixty pages has reached us, bearing the title "Modern Languages and Classics in America and Europe since 1880. Ten years' Progress of the New Learning." By A. F. Chamberlain, M.A., Fellow in Clark University, Worcester, Mass. The countries for which a general view of modern language work is here given, include the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Hungary, Germany, Norway and Sweden. For these the author marks the drift of sentiment expressed by scholars during the last decade on the relation of classical and modern language training. Liberal extracts are given from original documents, showing a wide range of reading and a bibliographical survey that must be of interest to the teacher, while the chronological order in which much of the material is presented will enable him to follow the trend of ideas as they have developed and been grouped about this, probably the most important, reform movement in the history of pedagogy of the nineteenth century. It is gratifying to note that the writer's heart is in the right place; the conclusion of his monograph brings us an expression of the following unbiased sentiment:

"These essays, in which an endeavour is made to indicate the present state of the world's thought on the question of the comparative merits of the ancient and the modern languages, are penned in no spirit of opposition to Greek."

PERSONAL.

Dr. Ewald Flügel, Privatdocent at the University of Leipzig, has been elected Professor of English Philology at the Leland Stanford Jr. University. Dr. Flügel is already well known to American Students of English as one of the editors of *Anglia* and of the *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, to which he has contributed many articles. He is also the author of a critical edition of Sir Philip Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella,' and 'Defense of Poesie' (Halle, 1889).

Mr. C. H. Grandgent, Director of Modern Languages in the Boston High and Latin Schools, has in press (Ginn & Co., N. Y.) a small work on 'German and English Sounds.'

Professor H. C. O. Huss (Princeton College) has in press annotated selections from Hugo's 'Les Misérables,' which are intended for advanced students in French. This editor is also preparing a collection of French idioms adapted to the use of lower grade students.

Frederic Spencer, M.A., Professor of Modern Languages in the University College of North Wales, has been appointed Examiner in the Mediæval and Modern Languages Tripos of Cambridge (England) University.

Prof. W. T. Hewett (Cornell University) is engaged on a volume of essays entitled 'University Life in the Middle Ages, and other Essays,' which will contain papers on the History of the University of Leiden; the House of Orange; University Administration; and the poets Goethe, Schiller and Lessing.

Professor Hugo Schuchardt (University of Graz, Austria) is engaged on a special work dealing with Negro English. In order to treat this subject as fully as possible, the author would esteem it a favor, if writers of newspaper articles (or other casual contributions to local journals) bearing on the material, would forward to him directly copies of said articles, or indicate the same through the columns of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEN DEUTSCHEN UNTERRICHT. VOL. V, NO. 5.—Vogel, T., Wie erzielen wir bessere deutsche Aufsätze in den Oberklassen.—Hildebrand, R., Wie die Sprache altes Leben fortführt, vii.—Bechstein, R., Der Unartig Teutscher Sprach-Verderber und seine beiden Ausgaben vom Jahre 1843.—Menge, K., Goethe und Wieland vor Napoleon in Erfurt und Weimar. Nach Talleyrands Memoiren.—Biedermann, W. Frh. von, Heidenrölslein.—Burghauser, G., Zur Lehre vom 'zusammenggezogenen' Satze.—Sprenger, R., Zum Urfaust.—No. 6. Hildebrand, R., Zu Fausts Glaubensbekenntniß, dabei von einer bedeutsamen Eigenheit in Goethe's Denk- und Sprachweise.—Schmalz, J. H., Der deutsche Unterricht auf der v. badischen Direktorenconferenz.—Goepfert, E., Unser Haus und Heim im Lichte der Sprache und Kulturgeschichte.—Schaeffer, T., Stil und Stilübungen.—Klee, G., Drei Weidmannsbriege aus dem vorigen Jahrhundert.—No. 7. Hildebrand, R., Olymp und Himmel, dabei etwas von hohlen Bergen und vom Echo.—Graeber, F., Deutsche Aufsätze in Tertia.—Landmann, K., Richard Wagner als Nibelungendichter.—Hoffmann, P., Metrische Studien zu Schillers Jugenddramen.—Künzel, K., Einführung in die Geschichte der deutschen Sprache.—Festl, S., Eine Art dramatischer Lektüreim deutschen Unterricht der unteren Klassen.—No. 8. Hildebrand, R., Deutschland grammatisch, zur Geschichte seiner Form.—Koch, K., Zum deutschen Aufsatz in den unteren und mittleren Klassen.—Strobel, K., Etwas vom Lesen und Lesebuch in der Volksschule.—Franke, K., Wo und wie studiert man ausserhalb des Kollegs und der Studierstube Germanistik?—Maydorn, B., Gegen den Mißbrauch des Apostrophs.—Schultz, F., Ferdinand, Albas, und Don Karlos, Philipps Sohn. Eine Aufsatzbesprechung.—Draheim, H., Zu Goethe und Schiller.—No. 9. Hildebrand, R., Zum Wesen des Reims auch des Stabreims, dabei eine Berichtigung Scherers.—Gloede, O., Zur Erklärung des Hasennamens Lampe.—Lyon, O., Goethe's Gespräche.—Sprenger, R., Bemerkungen zu den deutschen Volksliedern.—Gloel, H., Wider die Chrie.—Zuern, L., Die Lektüre der Hamburgischen Dramaturgie Lessings in der Oberprima.—No. 10. Hildebrand, R., Zur Metrik des Nibelungenliedes.—Nebe, A., Die Lehnwörter im deutschen Unterricht.—Speck, E., Zur Erklärung von Schillers Jungfrau von Orleans.—Cremer, W., Wanderungen und Wandlungen eines Volksliedes.—No. 11. Lyon, O., Friedrich Zarncke.—Hildebrand, R., Vom umgelegten Rhythmus.—Gloede, O., Über Tiernamen im Volksmund und in der Dichtung.—Zerglebel, E. H., Zur Behandlung von Uhland's Gedicht 'Der blinde König'.—Branky, F., Die Präposition *entlang* mit dem Dative.—Kamp, H., Zwei Aufsatzthematata aus Emilia Galotti.—Loebell, R., Zum Kapitel: 'Goethe ein grosser Nehmer' (Goethe und Merck).—No. 12. Hildebrand, R., Zu der sogenannten Inversion nach *und*.—Boesche, G., Zur Frage der Entlastung der Lehrer des Deutschen an höheren Lehranstalten.—Fauth, F., Die Notwendigkeit der Übung im lauten, freien und zusammenhängenden Lesen aus der Natur der Sprache erwiesen.—Wasserzieher, E., Eine stilistische Eigentümlichkeit Wilhelm Jordans.—Semler, C., Carlos in Goethes Clavigo und die

Weltanschauung der Neuzeit.—Biese, A., Die Naturlyrik Ludwig Uhlands und Eduard Mörikes.—Dietrich, R., Der deutsche Unterricht in der pädagogischen Presse des Jahres 1890.—Wuestenfeld, L., Iphigenia und Hamlet.

GERMANIA. VOL. XXXV, NO. 3.—Boehme, O., Die Übereinstimmung zwischen dem Wigaloistexte und den Lesarten der Handschriftengruppe Bb in Hartmanns Iwein.—Borlinski, K., Zur Warnung.—Grimme, F., Die Schweizer Minnesänger.—Gloede, O., Noch einmal zur Tristansage.—Bech, F., Leseerfrüchte (Schluss).—No. 4. Walther, P., Bruchstück einer Handschrift des Rolandsliedes.—Behaghel, O., Bruchstück des Parzival.—Euling, K., Mnd. geistliche Gedichte.—Bahlmann, P., Die Sprichwörter aus des Johannes Murrellius 'Pappa puerorum'.—Ehrismann, G., Zum Schlegel des Rüdiger von Hunthofen.—Sprenger, R., Zu Albers Tnugdalu.—Grimme, E., Zum Leben Ulrichs von Lichtenstein.—Faber, M., Hans Rosenplüt ein Rothschild.—Damkoecher, E., Zum Satzbau bei Luther; Zu Gerhard von Minden.—Brenner, O., Zu Germania 34, 369.—Behaghel, O., Zum Lanzelet Ulrichs von Zazikoven.—Ehrismann, G., Bibliographische Übersicht der Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1886 (Schluss).—VOL. XXXVI, NO. 1. Stiefel, A. L., Über die Quellen der Hans Sachs'schen Dramen.—Maurer, K., Über Ari Froßi und seine Schriften.—Bechstein, R., Ludwig Wirth, Die Oster- und Passionsspiele bis zum xvi. Jahrhundert.—Ehrismann, G., Bibliographische Übersicht der Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1887.—No. 2. Michels, V., Zur Beurtheilung von J. Grimms Ansicht über das grammatische Geschlecht.—Ehrismann, G., Ahd. *liuzil-lutail*.—Jellinek, M., Zur declination der ahd. Abstracta.—Hirt, Zur Metrik des as. und ahd. Alliterationsverses.—Roth, Deutschlateinische Gedichte aus der Zeit des dreissigjährigen Krieges.—Fraenkel, Bemerkungen zur Entwicklung des Grobianismus.—Sprenger, R., Zu Reineke Vos; zu Reinhart Fuchs.—Bartsch, A., Drei Akrosticha.—Kochler, R., Eine koptische Variante der Legende von Gregorius auf dem Steine.—Lohmeyer, E., Zu Germania xxxi, 325.—No. 3. Behaghel, O., Zu Hans von Büchel.—Bartsch, A., Bruchstücke einer Handschrift der 'Königstochter' Hans des Büchelers.—Behaghel, O., Zu Wolframs Liedern.—Bechstein, R., K. Koppmann, Zu Walther.—Roth, F. W. E., Mittheilungen aus mhd. Handschriften.—Schmidt, R., Ein Bruchstück eines deutschen Cato; Alte Ergänzungen des Alphabets.—Buchwald, G., Eine Quaestio 'Quodlibetica' des Johann Fabri de Werdea aus dem Jahre 1502.—Hirt, H., Zur Metrik des as. und ahd. Alliterationsverses (Schluss).—Fraenkel, L., Zum Proteusmärchen und anderen wandernden Stoffen.—Socin, A., Zu den Schweizer Minnesängern.—Ehrismann, G., Drittes Paulinzeller Rennerbruchstück.—Behaghel, O., Zu Germania, xxxvi, 2.—Schmidt, L., Arminius und Siegfried.—Steiff, K., Nachtrag.—Grillenberger, O., Zu R. Köhlers Abhandlung: 'Mich wundert, dass ich fröhlich bin'.—Ehrismann, G., Wer nich weiss was rechte Lieb sei; Bibliographische Übersicht der Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1887.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1892.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "GAMMER GURTON'S NEEDLE."

THE first printed edition of "Gammer Gurton's Needle," the second English comedy, was issued in 1575, and as the title-page of this edition has an important bearing on the question of authorship, it is well to reproduce it here in its original form. This title-page runs as follows:

"A Ryght Pithy, Pleasaunt, and Mérie Comedie:
Intytuled
GAMMER GURTON'S NEEDLE:
Played on Stage, not long ago in Christes College in
Cambridge.
Made by Mr. S. Master of Art.
Imprinted at London in Fleetestreat, beneth the
conduit, at the signe of S. John Evangelist,
by Thos. Colwell.
1575."

The play was first attributed to John Still in Baker's 'Biographia Dramatica' (vol. ii, p. 691 f.). This work was originally compiled to the year 1764 by David Erskine Baker, was continued thence to 1782 by Isaac Reed, and was brought down to the end of Nov. 1811 by Stephen Jones. It was published in its completed form in London, four volumes, 1812. As I have had before me only this last edition, it is somewhat difficult to assign an exact date to the statement regarding Still. But of the three editions I think that of 1782 is the one in which Still was first mentioned as the author of the play. There are two reasons for this opinion:

1. If Still had been mentioned as the author in the edition of 1764, it seems certain that Hawkins ('Origin of the English Drama,' 1773) or Warton ('History of English Poetry,' 1775), or both, would have noted the fact and not have classed the play as anonymous. This silence on the part of Hawkins and Warton excludes the edition of 1764.

2. Still is mentioned as the author by Malone in his 'History of the English Stage' (in his edition of Shakespeare's works, 1790), and Malone evidently got this fact from the 'Bio-

¹ This reference is to the edition of 1812.

graphia Dramatica.' His statement, therefore, excludes the edition of 1812.

The statement of the 'Biographia Dramatica' in regard to Still's authorship is as follows:

"His name as a dramatic writer has been hitherto unknown; but there are circumstances to induce a belief that he was the author of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. C. 4to Black letter. 1575.

In the Bursar's books of Christ's College, 9 Eliz. (i. e., 1566), is the following entry: 'Item for the Carpenters setting upp the scaffold at the Plaie xx^d.' As at that time there was no other master of arts of Christ's College whose name began with the letter S; and as it is not probable that any other person than one belonging to the house where the play was acted, would be employed in writing it, there is little reason to hesitate about ascribing this piece to our author."

On this slight piece of evidence have been founded all subsequent attributions of the play to Still. The historians of the drama,² with three exceptions, have adopted Reed's view with a greater or less degree of assent. The three exceptions are Joseph Hunter, George L. Craik, and J. J. Jusserand. Let us notice Craik first (though his criticism is later than Hunter's), as he very successfully refutes Reed's argument. In his 'Sketches of the History of Literature and Learning in England from the Norman Conquest,'³ Craik thus speaks of the authorship:

"The evidence that Bishop Still was the author of Gammer Gurton's Needle is exceedingly slight. The play is merely stated on the title-page to have been 'made by Mr. S., Master of Arts;' and even if there was, as is asserted, no other Master of Arts of Christ's College whose name began with an S at the time when the title-page was printed, the author of the play is not stated to have been of that college, nor, if he were, is it necessary to assume that he was living in 1575."

The original statement of Reed can be further answered by the fact that both in 1566 and 1575 there was living, besides Still, another Master of Arts of Christ's College whose name began with S. William Sander.

² I do not include here such historians as Scott and Schlegel, who have not touched on the question of authorship.

³ London, 1844-5, 6 vols. Vol. iii, p. 24 f.

son took his M. A. degree there in 1555, and lived until about the year 1589. Besides Still and Sanderson there were twelve M.A.'s whose names began with S of the different colleges of Cambridge who took their degrees in or before 1566 and were living in 1575.

I next come to the criticism of Joseph Hunter, the eminent antiquary, well-known through his 'New Illustrations of Shakespeare.' This criticism is contained in his 'Chorus Vatum Anglicanarum, collections concerning the Poets and Verse-Writers of the English Nation,' the date of which is 1838, though additions have been made at later periods. This work was acquired by the British Museum in 1863 (where it is MS. Addit. 24487), and has never been published. Through the courtesy of Dr. Richard Garnett, Keeper of Printed Books in the Museum, I was recently enabled to secure a copy of Hunter's paper on the authorship of the play. The paper has as the title,

"John Still John Bridges
Bishop of Bath and Wells. Bishop of Salisbury."⁴

It is inaccurate, discursive, and hardly does more than suggest that Still was not the author; yet it is interesting as being the first attempt to disprove the current attribution of the play to him. After quoting Reed's argument, Hunter says:

"That it was performed at Christ College is amply proved, but that the author was of that college is a non sequitur, since all that is asserted is that he was M. A., it may be presumed of Cambridge."

Hunter sums up by saying: "On the whole I think it improbable that he (Still) was the author."

The third critic to dissent from the current attribution of the play to Still was Jusserand in his 'Le Théâtre en Angleterre.' In a note to his criticism of the play, he says:

"Elle a été généralement attribuée à John Still, évêque de Bath et de Wells, né vers 1543, mort en 1593 (*sic*). Cette hypothèse me semble inadmissible. D'abord la pièce fut probablement imprimée sous le titre de *Diccon of Bedlam* en 1563, époque à laquelle Still n'avait que vingt ans; elle fut sûrement jouée en 1566:

⁴ This is a mistake: Bridges was Dean of Salisbury and Bishop of Oxford.

⁵ Paris, 1881. Pp. 180 and 181, note.

Still n'avait alors que 23 ans. De plus, s'il avait fait jouer cette pièce devant la reine, en 1566, aurait-il pu, en 1592, devenu vice-chancelier de Cambridge, demander à Elizabeth de ne point faire jouer les étudiants devant elle en anglais, mais en latin?

"Il me semble surtout que cette comédie n'a pas, en ce qui concerne la religion, le ton des pièces postérieures à la Réforme. Gammer Gurton brûle un cierge à Sainte-Anne, sans qu'il y ait intention railleuse du poète; le curé est catholique; dans le prologue, on dit que dame Chat ne comprend pas plus les menées de Diccon que Tom, le clerc, ce que le prêtre dit à la messe.

"Le ton est absolument celui qu'on avait au temps de Henri VIII; la satire (rôle du Dr Rat, le curé) est la même que chez Heywood, le '*bigoted catholic*.' Still, d'ailleurs, était protestant, se maria deux fois et eut plusieurs enfants. Sa pièce a été composée, sans doute, au temps où la Réforme n'avait pas encore prévalu; peut-être fut-elle retouchée légèrement avant d'être jouée en 1566; mais on y laissa les allusions à la religion catholique, comme on avait fait pour les Mystères de Chester."

These last remarks of Jusserand call attention to the date of the play, about which there has been much dispute. The older critics advocated the date of 1551 or thereabouts, while recent critics have adopted the later date of 1562 or 1563. It will be easily seen that this question of date has an important bearing on the question of Still's authorship; for if it can be proved, either from external or internal evidence, that the play was written in 1551 or even before, then at once the hypothesis that Still was the author falls to the ground. For, in 1551, he was only eight years old. From the present state of our knowledge as to the date of the play, we have not enough external evidence on which to base a positive statement; from Jusserand's arguments, it is seen that the internal evidence points rather to the earlier date. Still I may say, that after having examined carefully all the evidence accessible on both sides, it seems to me that the more probable date is the later one—about 1562.

It may be well here to notice the list of writers, some of them of eminent authority, who have since 1782 joined in attributing the play to Still. In this list are to be found Malone (1790) and nearly all the nineteenth century critics of the drama and biographers

of Still: Gilliland ('Dramatic Mirror,' 1808), Chalmers ('Biographical Dictionary,' 1816), Nathan Drake ('Shakespeare and his Times,' 1817), Hazlitt ('Lit. of Age of Elizabeth,' 1821), Maginn ('Noctes Ambrosianae,' No. iv, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1822), Granger ('Biographical History of England,' 1824), Dibdin ('Library Companion,' 1824), Cassan ('Lives of Bishops of Bath and Wells,' 1829-30), White ('Old English Drama,' 1830), Collier ('Annals of the Stage,' 1831), Hallam ('Literature of Europe,' 1837-9), D'Israeli ('Amenities of Literature,' 1840), Chambers ('Cyclopaedia of English Literature,' 1843), Halliwell ('Dictionary of Old English Plays,' 1860), Cooper ('Athenae Cantabrigienses,' 1861), W. C. Hazlitt ('Bibliography of Old English Literature,' 1867), Allibone ('Dictionary of English Literature,' 1870), Ward ('English Dramatic Literature,' 1875), Klein ('Geschichte des englischen Dramas,' 1876), Symonds ('Shakspeare's Predecessors,' 1884), Saintsbury ('Elizabethan Literature,' 1887), and Fleay ('Chronicle History of the London Stage,' 1890). These criticisms range in positiveness from the statement of White, "There seems no doubt that it was the work of Mr. John Still," to that of Ward, "The authorship of the play is attributed (on not quite conclusive evidence) to John Still."⁶

It now remains to bring forward other arguments to show that Still was not the author of the play. All these arguments must depend on external evidence; for, in Still's case, we have nothing whatever in the way of poems or verses, on which to base a comparison with the play. We have, therefore, to rely on contemporary testimony (entirely negative in this case) and on that of writers who lived during the century and a half that followed Still's death.

I. CONTEMPORARY TESTIMONY.

a. Attention has been called to the following piece of evidence both by Collier and Jusserand, but in both cases it was not used in exactly the same way that I shall employ here. Collier thus speaks of the circumstance:

⁶ To this list must be added Morley ('English Writers,' viii, 1892) and Fleay ('Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama,' 1891), whose works came to hand after the above was written. Fleay states in his work (ii, 254) that "the authorship has been all but unanimously ascribed to Still."

"In December, 1592, Dr. John Still . . . was at the head of the University of Cambridge; and a command was received from London, that a comedy in English should be got up there for the amusement of the Queen, as in consequence of the prevalence of the plague, her own actors could not play before her at Christmas."⁷

This command caused the authorities to write to Lord Burghley asking for further time for preparation and for liberty to substitute a Latin for an English comedy. This letter was signed by John Still as Vice-Chancellor, and the portion that bears on the question before us is as follows:

"Englishe Comedies, for that wee never used any, wee presentlie have none: to make or translate one in such shortnes of time wee shall not be able."

It seems strange that Still, if he had written "Gammer Gurton's Needle," would say of a University where that play was performed, that it had never used any English comedy.

b. Sir John Harington (1561-1612), the pupil, the intimate friend, and the parishioner of Still, gives, in his 'Briefe View of the State of the Church of England' (1608),⁸ a succinct account of Still's character. Here Harington relates some incidents in Still's life, but says nothing of Still's connection with the drama. The sketch is not really biographical, but rather pleasant, chatty, personal, and full of anecdotes; in fact, it is the very place where we should expect to find some mention of Still as a dramatist, if he were such. It is noticeable that Harington, in speaking of Bridges, makes mention of his writings in prose and verse; if Still had written anything of note, why did not Harington mention it? The silence of Harington on this point is certainly significant.

c. All the qualities and characteristics of Still of which we know, are against connecting him with such a comedy as "Gammer Gurton's Needle" with its low humor and extreme broadness of expression. It is against all the known facts of his life that he should have written such a play. Of course, it is not held that these facts alone would prevent our con-

⁷ 'Annals of the Stage,' ii, 293.

⁸ In 'Nugae Antiquae,' London, 1804, 2 vols. Vol. ii, p. 157 f.

necting the play with Still, but, as our evidence is largely cumulative, they must be given their due importance. The main facts of Still's life are given in several accessible authorities,⁹ and there is no need of repeating these facts here. It may be noted, however, in passing that there seemed to be no opposition to his accession to the many high offices he held on the score of any scandal or previous misdemeanor connected with his name. It is stated by Harington that Still came to his bishopric "without any touch or scandall."

Several contemporaries of Still testify to his high character. Archbishop Parker said that Still was "a man of much staidness and gravity," and in 1573, when Still was only thirty, spoke thus of him: "I took him, tho' so young, to be more mortified than others of forty or fifty." Harington thus speaks of him:

"Who hath given me some helpes, more hopes, all encouragements in my best studies; to whom I never came, but I grew more religious; from whom I never went, but I parted better instructed. . . . His breeding was from his childhood in good literature and partly in musique. . . . I hold him a rare man for preaching, for arguing, for learning, for lyving; I could only wish, that in all these he would make lesse use of logique, and more of rhetorick."

In a letter of Gabriel Harvey to Spenser occurs this tribute to Still:

"Tho' truly I suppose he had need be an excellent philosopher, a reasonable good Historian, a learned Divine, a wise man, such a one as Dr. Still or Dr. Bing that should show himself in this argument."¹⁰

Hunter queries about this:

"Would not Harvey have alluded to his poetic power, if Still had been known as a writer of verse?"

As Harvey and Still were personal friends, this is certainly a pertinent question.

There is danger in laying too great stress on arguments drawn from the facts of Still's life or from contemporary testimony as to his high character. We must be careful not to look at the question from our nineteenth century point of view, but we should rather remember that in Still's day the notions of people were looser than at present. Life ran higher, licence to a

great degree was permitted, and coarseness was a characteristic of nearly all works. It was also not an uncommon thing for churchmen to write plays. The point, therefore, that I wish to make with regard to Still is not that it was out of keeping with the age for a churchman to write a play, but rather that there is nothing in his life and character to suggest a connection with the drama. It might be added that we have no evidence that Still had taken orders in 1562, the probable date of the play.

2. TRADITIONARY EVIDENCE.

Does any tradition come down to us through the writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that would in any way connect Still with "Gammer Gurton's Needle"? As was said by Reed (1782), "His name as a dramatic writer has been hitherto unknown;" but is it not possible that some work or works, dealing with Still or the drama, may contain a hint as to Still's authorship of the play? It seems highly probable that Reed did not examine all the authorities, and hence he may have missed some allusion to Still's authorship. An examination of the authorities accessible, however, shows an absolute silence on the question.

Fuller ('Worthies,' 1662, and 'History of Cambridge,' 1655), Wood ('Athenae Oxonienses,' 1691-2), Strype (in his numerous historical and biographical works), Langbain (1652-92—'Account of the English Dramatic Poets;' no date), Wright ('Historia Histrionica,' 1699), Newcourt ('Repertorium Ecclesiasticum,' 1708-10), Jacob ('Poetical Register,' 1724), Hearne ('Duo Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Veteres,' 1732), Peck ('Desiderata Curiosa,' 1732-5), Baker ('History of St. John's College,' about 1740), Chetwood ('General History of the Stage,' 1749), Hawkins (1773), and Warton (1775);—all these writers treat more or less fully of Still or "Gammer Gurton's Needle," but in no case are the two connected with each other. Too much dependence must not be put on the silence of these old writers; but some of them were very laborious and painstaking antiquarians.

I have now reached the end of the arguments advanced against Still's authorship, and I therefore sum up: The only evidence we have that the play was by Still is the attribution

⁹ For instance, Cooper's 'Athenae Cantab.,' ii, 467 f.

¹⁰ 'Spenser's Works,' 1750, vi, 307.

of it to him by the 'Biographia Dramatica' two hundred and twenty years after the play was written; this attribution was based on a mere supposition, which has long been disproved by Craik and Hunter, and moreover contains a statement that an examination of the records of the University of Cambridge shows to be false. All succeeding critics have attributed the play to Still, partly on the authority of the 'Biographia Dramatica,' partly because a tradition emanating from that work was afloat. All the evidence that we have in regard to Still or the play is strongly against his authorship. As far as I have been able to discover, there is no contemporary evidence that in the least favors or hints at his authorship of the play: Still's own words as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge are a piece of indirect evidence against it; Sir John Harington's negative testimony is against it; contemporary testimony from churchmen and writers are against it; finally, there is not a particle of traditional evidence, so to say, that speaks for it. In other words, those very authorities who we should suppose would give us some positive information as to Still's authorship, give very strong negative testimony to the contrary. I hence conclude from the evidence before me that John Still did not write "Gammer Gurton's Needle," and that the burden of proof rests on those who maintain that he did.

This leaves the play for the moment without any known author, and we are now confronted with the question: Is there any evidence that can connect the play with any other writer of the second half of the sixteenth century? This may be answered in the affirmative; for there is strong testimony that the play was the work of John Bridges, afterwards Dean of Salisbury and Bishop of Oxford.

Attention has been called to the authorship of Bridges by three writers. The first of these is Joseph Hunter, whose work, as has been noted, has never been published; the others are Prof. A. W. Ward and Mr. Sidney L. Lee, both of whom do not attribute the play to Bridges. Let us first notice Hunter's statements:

"It (*the play*) was however attributed by a contemporary to quite a different person.

This was Dr. John Bridges, against whom one of the Marprelate tracts is directed."

Here follows the reference to the play in the famous "Epistle" (to be given presently), and Hunter continues:

"This is certainly a testimony not to be despised. If there is anything in the charge, we must suppose the 'Mr. S.' to be a blind or a mistake, or a mistake of the original publisher.

"It has remained I believe hitherto unnoticed. It is supported however by this circumstance that Dr. Bridges did write in verse, another piece being attributed to him, namely a Sheet in rhyme of all the names attributed to the Lord in the Bible. . . . He was of Pembroke Hall the *poetical* college. . . .

"On the whole I incline at present to the opinion that Bishop Bridges rather than Bishop Still was the author of this play; or, if we must take a middle way, that both were concerned in it."

Prof. Ward has this to say in a footnote in his 'History of English Dramatic Literature,'¹¹

"From a passage in Martin Marprelate's Epistle (1588) it would appear that Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, the author of the *Defence of Church Government* attacked in that celebrated libel, had been credited with the authorship of this play. But M. M. thinks that the internal evidence of 'somme witte and invention' in the author of the play disproves the supposition."

Mr. Lee, in his sketch of Bridges in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,'¹² says:

"The satirists state doubtfully that he was the author of 'Gammer Gurton's Needle,' usually attributed to Bishop Still."

Are the statements of the satirists doubtful? Let us examine them, and see for ourselves. All of the evidence in favor of the authorship of Bridges is contemporary. The earliest reference to him as the author is to be found in Martin Marprelate's famous "Epistle to the terrible Priests of the Confocation house" (1588).¹³ This pseudonymous pamphleteer is addressing Bridges, and the reference is as follows (p. 10):

"You have bin a worthy writer as they say of a long time; your first book was a proper

¹¹ Vol. i, p. 142, note 4.

¹² Vol. vi, p. 321.

¹³ 'Puritan Discipline Tracts.' Published by John Peterham, London, 1843. Reprinted by Mr. Edward Arber in 'English Scholar's Library,' No. 11. London, 1878.

Enterlude, called Gammar Gurton's needle. But I thinke that this trifle, which sheweth the author to haue had some witte and invention in him, was none of your doing: Because your bookes seeme to proceede from the braynes of a Woodcocke, as having neither wit nor learning."

This very caustic criticism must be taken in its real sense: it is intensely *ironical*, as in fact is the whole "Epistle," which is pitched on a high key of extravagance and vituperation. We must, therefore, not accept too readily the literalness of Martin's statements.

But it is not only in the "Epistle" that the play is attributed to Bridges, but there are equally as strong references in this direction in Martin Marprelate's "Epitome" (1589).¹⁴ This is an epitome of the first book of Bridges's work, 'Defence of Church Government.' On p. 26 Martin says (he is addressing Bridges):

"Do you thinke that you can answer men, by saying that you indeed wrote page 59. . . . This is a prettie aunswere, is it not thinke you? Let me take you againe in such a pranck, and ile course you, as you were better to be seeking Gammer Gurton's needle, then come within my fingers."

Again on p. 55:

"In deed Master D. (Bridges) quoteth no author for his warraunt, he is redd you know in the Legend of lies. There it is: "There is a book of this name, which M. doctor made as they say." what haue the puritans to doe where he found it? Let the answer be to it. What if he founde it in Hodge his breeches, seeking for Gammer Gurton's needle?"

On this latter passage Petheram has the following note:

"P. 55, l. 7. *he is redd you know in the Legend of lies.*] Although the marginal note attributes a book with this title to Bp. Aylmer,¹⁵ Martin probably meant nothing more than that the comedy of 'Gammer Gurton's Needle,' which was written by Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Still, was attributed to him; all dramatic pieces probably being estimated by strict Puritans as Legends of lies."

There is a reference to "Gammer Gurton's Needle" in Thomas Nashe's 'Martin's Month's Mind' (1589),¹⁶ in which tract is given an

¹⁴ 'Puritan Disciplin Tracts.' Published by Petheram, London, 1843. Also reprinted by Mr. Arber, London, 1878.

¹⁵ This is a mistake. Petheram evidently meant Bp. Bridges.

¹⁶ Complete Works of Thomas Nashe. Edited by A. B. Grosart. 'Huth Library,' 1883-84. Vol. i.

account of "the Death and Buriall of Martin Marprelate." Martin is on his death-bed, and calls his sons around him. To these he makes his dying confession (p. 179 f.):

"Three things there are (my sonnes) that were my bane. . . . The first was my *foolerie*. . . . After that some of our companions had dealt sagelie in the cause, and gained good credite with some of some sort; in lept I (like a woodcocke I must confesse) with twatling tales . . . of *Gammer Gurton's Needle, etc., etc., . . . in my Epistle.*"

In the preface "To the Reader," Nashe thus refers to Bridges (p. 164):

"As *who then, I coulde a tolde te tat. Good Neames and Nunkaes. And Kankerburie. With Ka. John O Bridges.*"¹⁷

And just below:

"So that now, the Stage is brought into the Church; and vices make places of Church matters."

Before leaving the testimony of the Marprelate tracts it may be well to notice a statement made by Mr. Saintsbury in regard to them. In his 'Elizabethan Literature' (p. 55), he says:

"*Gammer Gurton's Needle*, attributed to and all but certainly known to be by John Still, afterwards bishop. On the question of authorship, it may be observed that the positive attribution of Martin Marprelate made during Still's life, and, bishop as he was, rather as a compliment than otherwise, seems (inasmuch as it provoked no contradiction from the vigilant scrutineers of any hole in Martin's coat) decisive."

Not all of the Marprelate tracts have been accessible to me; but the evidence of those I have read, is entirely on the side of the authorship of Bridges. Still's name is not once mentioned, and he does not seem to have had any connection whatever with the Marprelate controversy. Mr. Saintsbury's remark is, therefore, very likely, a mistake.

Attention has been called to the fact that Bridges was not only a theologian but also a poet. Besides the work mentioned above by Hunter, Bridges published in 1604 a work entitled 'Novum Testamentum in Hexametris versus . . . translatum,' thus showing that he possessed facility in versification. We have a

¹⁷ These expressions are very obscure: *Neames* and *Nunkaes* are synonyms for "uncles;" *Kankerburie* is evidently Canterbury; what the others mean I do not know.

piece of contemporary testimony to the fame of Bridges as a writer and a poet: Sir John Harington, in the work that is quoted above, thus speaks of Bridges (ii. 201):

"The good father, . . . Doctor John Bridges, a man whose vollumes in prose and verse give sufficient testimonie of his industrie; though, for mine own part, I am grown an unfit praiser of poetrie, having taken such a surfeet of it in my youth, that I think now, a gray head and a vearse do not agree together, and much lesse a grave matter and a vearse. . . . I am almost of opinion, that one ought to abjure all Poetrie when he comes to Divinitie."

Not much is known concerning the life of Bridges, but he has become famous as that churchman who started the celebrated Marprelate controversy. All that is really known of the facts in his life is summed up by Mr. Lee in the 'Dictionary of National Biography.' I call attention to a few of these that have a bearing on our question.

The date of Bridges's birth is unknown, though it is stated that he died at a great age in 1618. He took his M.A. at Cambridge in 1560, and this date is in accord with the dates of the composition and production of "Gammer Gurton's Needle." The fact also that he spent some years in Italy in his youth would tend to show that he early came under direct poetical influence. During his lifetime, he made translations from the Latin and the Italian, and in 1587 he published his greatest work, "A Defence of the Government established in the Church of Englande," a ponderous quarto of 1412 pages. These various works show the versatility of his powers, and, despite the caustic irony of Martin, he must have been a man of some ability and no little strength of character. In a stormy and eventful period in church affairs, he seems to have been a striking figure, and more than once was he called on to defend his church.

Having gone through all the evidence in favor of the authorship of Bridges, it may be well to sum up: The biographer of Bridges, Lee, and the historian of the English drama, Ward, refuse to attribute the play to Bridges, but accept the current attribution of it to Still; but as early as 1838 Hunter suggested that Bridges might be the author. All of the contemporary evidence is in favor of Bridges: it is striking how often his name and that of the

play are connected together in the various Marprelate tracts. It may be objected to this evidence, that the satirist is heaping ridicule on Bridges, and would resort to such a shift—namely, that of attributing such a low and vulgar performance to a churchman high in power—to help his cause. But another prominent churchman, Bishop Bale, wrote a play, "Kynge Johan," that is quite as vulgar as "Gammer Gurton's Needle;" besides, the latter play is not connected with any other churchman, though Martin satirizes a good many. It must have been the opinion current at the time, that Bridges wrote the play.

The difficulty that presents itself is the "Mr. S. Master of Art;" but may not this be taken as a blind or a mistake? Is it not possible that in those days of poor printing and many typographical errors an S might be easily mistaken for a B? Is it right to hang all question of authorship on a single initial, when all the weight of evidence is against the authorship of any one whose name begins with S?

I conclude that, while the evidence is perhaps not strong enough to declare positively that he wrote the play, yet there is a strong probability that John Bridges was the author of "Gammer Gurton's Needle."

CHARLES H. ROSS.

Johns Hopkins University.

NOTES TO 'HERMANN UND DOROTHEA.'

I am indebted to Professor Brandt for his very full notes upon my edition of 'Hermann und Dorothea,' and especially for his careful verification of the references. He has also called my attention to certain points that I had overlooked which were worthy of comment.

There are a few questions which the reviewer raises, or discusses, that are deserving of consideration beyond the subject which has called them out. He doubts very properly whether the form *Nächte* in Cantos viii, 56 and ix, 10, can have survived in the literary language of the eighteenth century from the M. H. G. gen. sing. *nehete*. The question is certainly pertinent, and evidence of such survival should be available in Goethe's other writings, or in the dialect which he occasionally used, or in other literature of the time.

In a hasty examination of "Der junge Goethe" I find no similar instance, though it may exist. I think we may say that the singular meaning is that which best accords with the sense, especially in the second instance, *der Nächte Gefahren*. In the early Latin versions of 'Hermann und Dorothea,' *Nächte* is translated in these cases by the singular.

The noun *Nacht* presents a wide variety of forms owing to the mingling of various declensions in its inflexion. Goethe himself uses *zu Nachts*, *bei Nachte*, and *Nacht* (acc. pl.); Wagner translates *Nächte* by "patches of darkness" in the former case, but I find no parallel uses to justify this, although one or two cases occur of the use of *Nächte* in the plural in a transferred sense, 'spiritual doubts.' All this shows how greatly we need a dictionary of Goethe's writings, based upon the original texts and upon his letters and diaries. Such a work would throw great light upon the chaotic condition of the language at the close of the eighteenth century and be extremely valuable for the light which it would throw upon other works of the period.

The history of the word *Römer*, as applied to a drinking glass, is still obscure in spite of Friedrich's conjecture that it is derived from a material *vitrum Romanum*, employed in enamel. The art of the first enamels manufactured in Germany came from the east. Glasses are more commonly named from their shape or place of manufacture, than from the material from which they are made. The earliest quotations given by Heyne are from the years 1589 and 1609. The term 'Roman glass' appears in Eraclius, of the twelfth century: *er sach dā manic roemisch glas*, line 856, where it relates to jewels, enamels or mosaic. I quoted Skeat as presenting about the only explanation, though I knew no historical basis for it. I suspect that light will be thrown on the history of the word from its use in Netherlandish. Its extensive currency in the Low German dialects and the meaning, often emphasized, of a large glass, explains a supposed connection of the word with *Raum*.

The word appears in Dutch first in Kilian (1574), as *roomer*: Gron. *ruimer* points to an umlaut of *o* (Dutch *oe*): West-Flemish *rommer* also suggests *o*, but the *nebenform rum-*

mer whence Eng. *rummer* is unexpected. The word undoubtedly arose in the Low countries in the sixteenth century with the art of manufacturing Venetian glass, and was then adopted into High German.

The word *Bracke* or *Bräke*, 'whiffle-tree,' is a Low German word. The use of *Bräke*, 'flail,' 'hemp-breaker,' which seems kindred to it, occurs in many Low German dialects, also in the sense of 'brush-wood,' or 'fragment of wood.' I do not find *Bracke* in 'Grimm' in this sense, though it occurs in 'Sanders.'

The word *spring-bar* for *whiffle-tree* occurs. The form *spring-bar-tree*, I must join with Professor Brandt in abandoning, though I see no reason why the word *tree* may not have been added provincially, as in the case of so many other words; as, *low-tree*, *axle-tree*, *saddle-tree*; something like *Baum* in numerous compounds in German. In a note to v, 147, I quote from Uhland, and add the title of the poem. Professor Brandt thinks that here "Graf Eberhard der Ranschebart appears as an author." This is equivalent to saying that whoever quoted from Shelley and cited the source, "To the Skylark," ascribed the authorship of the poem to the skylark.

The note to i, 200, the reviewer regards as "misleading." But the quotation was not made to explain the meaning of *zu*, as he implies, but to illustrate the whole passage in a parallel quotation from Schiller, whose "Lied von der Glocke" was begun about the time Goethe was finishing 'Hermann und Dorothea,' with which Schiller was familiar.

Similarly in the note to vi, 147, the reviewer overlooks the fact that the quotation is not designed to contain the identical meaning of *häuslich*, but to illustrate from the companion poem the praise of domesticity with whatever qualities may be included in it, whether of frugality or carefulness.

It is not clear whether the reviewer's note to viii, 11, is intended as an emendation or elaboration of my brief note to *dräuet*. I nowhere say that *drohen* is found in Luther, though it occurs in translations of the Bible before Luther; as, in the so-called 'Fourth Translation' (1470) in the forms *drowen* and *dröwen*, also in Hans Sachs and in other fifteenth and sixteenth century writings. The

two forms *dräuen* and *drohen* exist side by side to the eighteenth century. It is impossible to be dogmatic in speaking of forms found in Luther. The same word occurs differently in successive editions of Luther's Bible, according to the printer and the place of publication, and even differs in various parts of the same edition. In the 'Wartburger Bibel' of 1534, we find a dozen cases where the form *drewen* appears in the Old Testament and Apocrypha; in the new Testament we find *bedrawen* and *drawen*, and occasionally *drewen*; in Luther's last revision of 1545, we find prevaillingly *drewen*; in the 'Kurfürsten-Bibel' of 1708, these forms are uniformly given as *dräuen* and *bedräuen*. In the Codex Teplensis which is almost identical with the first printed German Bible (1466), if not the original of the same, we find *drohen*, *droen*, and once *drowen*.

In Canto iv, 199, it is of course possible to read a sensuous meaning into the verse, but the pure, idyllic character of the poem and the words in the mouth of a mother, make such an interpretation foreign to its entire spirit. No criticism of this nature, so far as I know, appeared at the time, when jealous rivals and partisans sought to detract from the author's genius and the merits of the poem.

There is one criticism apparently general in character which the reviewer makes:

"The sources of a number of quotations are not given at all: or merely the author, or book and chapter, or act and scene are given."

There is occasionally an omission in stating the exact origin of a quotation, where I had accumulated references to special forms, or illustrative passages, but where subsequently, even with much labor, I could not recover the source. Such is the quotation to v, 179, which is from 'Die Gunst des Augenblicks.' Knowing the great difficulty of verifying authorities when reference is made to a special edition, which others often may not possess, I sought to make it possible for anyone, with any edition, to examine the original source, by quoting by book and chapter, act and scene, and also by volume and page of certain standard and accessible editions. Most of the references to which the reviewer objects were made in this way, and I know no better. No

system of quotation can be blinder than the other method used in the first volumes of Grimm and in Sanders.

One or two additional minor points may be mentioned. In Canto iii, 6, the expression *der Alten*, may well mean as the reviewer suggests 'of the forefathers,' or 'of our ancestors,' but it equally accords with the words and with the character of the ambitious, maxim-loving landlord to suppose that he attempted an apparently learned reference to the classics. In Canto vii, 185, the reviewer says, "*noch* does not mean additional." The passage is "*noch viele Grüsse befahl sie.*" I conceive of the scene as follows: Dorothea has given her parting salutation to the judge, l. 170, and to the invalid l. 172; then follows a parenthetical passage 173-185; many friends in the meantime have arrived l. 186; as Hermann draws Dorothea away, she turns and continues to send greetings to friends whom she is leaving. Any change of form of the translation seems to embody the same idea.

The forms *fein* and *redlich* in different versions of the narrative of the Salzburg Emigrants, were used in the same sense in the last century for 'honorable,' 'respectable,' 'excellent,' but it is to be regretted that 'honest' has no longer the meaning of 'honorable.'—That Gerhard's favorite hymn "Ich bin ein Gast auf Erden" does not illustrate the text from which it is derived (Ps. cxix, 19) and the source of the passage "Nur ein Fremdling ist der Mensch auf Erden," ix, 269, is an extraordinary judgment.—Any further examination of minor statements in the review is not necessary.

There are a few points upon which the reviewer did not touch which are worthy of mention. The translation of *Tafeln*, iii, 83, has produced a difference of opinion, some regarding it as 'frames,' others as meaning 'panes.' I find in Goethe's 'Tagebuch,' 2. Bd., August 28, 1797: "Es (die Fensterscheiben) sind länglich viereckte Tafeln."

Whewell's translation of 'Hermann und Dorothea' has been twice reprinted in this country, without acknowledgment, even in one case with an attempt at appropriation, as in the *Democratic Review* for 1848. The volume edited by S. E. Brownell, New York, 1849,

contains also Whewell's translation, with few modifications, so far as I have been able to examine it. Can any one tell me whether the translation by the Englishman Mellish, was ever published? It was complete, May 2, 1798, and he was to read aloud the first four Cantos to Goethe upon that day. See the 'Schiller-Goethe Briefwechsel,' No. 455. Mellish was intimate with the Weimar circle. He held, if I mistake not, the position of Consul General of Great Britain in Hamburg for many years. His translation of 'Maria Stuart' from Schiller's manuscript affords valuable material in determining the original form of this drama. I find that Mellish published about 1820 a volume of translations into English from the Latin and German, but I can learn nothing further about its contents.

As to the capacity of the English language to produce satisfactory hexameters, I have no question. Of course by English hexameters we mean following the laws of modern verse, and not attempting to reproduce the quantity of classical verse.

W. T. HEWETT.

Cornell University.

CONCERNING ENGLISH MYSTERY PLAYS.

IN the 'Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur' by Bernhard ten Brink, vol. ii, p. 290, we read:

"Dem geistlichen Drama von Chester wird das von Dublin Manches zu verdanken gehabt haben. In der Hauptstadt Irlands gab es—wenigstens seit dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert—Frohnleichnamsspiele, über deren Beschaffenheit wir leider sehr unvollkommen unterrichtet sind. Von dreizehn bis vierzehn Pageants kennen wir mehr oder weniger genau den Inhalt, ausserdem die Namen der Zünfte, welche sie aufführten. Erhalten ist uns darunter nur das Spiel der Weber: "Abraham und Isaak," dessen metrische Form uns sofort an den Chester-Cyclus gemahnt."

Through an investigation which, of late, I have been making concerning the English mystery plays, I have been led to question the above statement. The evidence upon which a cycle of plays has been credited to Dublin is stated in Whitelaw and Walsh's 'History of Dublin,' vol. i, p. 110, under "Pageants for Corpus Christi," in these words:

1. "Glovers. Adam and Eve with angel bearing sword before them.
2. Corrisees (perhaps curriers). Cain and Abel with offering and altar.
3. Mariners and vintners. Noah and the persons in the ark appaeled as carpenters and salmon-takers.
4. Weavers. Abraham and Isaac with offering and altar.
5. Smiths. Pharaoh and his host.
6. Skinners. Camel with the children of Israel.
7. Goldsmiths. King of Cullen.
8. Hoopers. Shepherds with an angel singing Gloria in excelsis Deo.
9. Corpus Christi gild. Christ in his passion with the Marys and angels.
10. Taylors. Pilate with his fellowship, and his wife cloathed accordingly.
11. Barbers. Anna and Caiaphas.
12. Fishers. The Apostles.
13. Merchants. The Prophets.
14. Butchers. The Tormentors."

These pageants are evidently carefully named in the order in which they pass in the procession. A little study will show that it is impossible to construct a cycle out of these pageants taken in this order, or in any order. The Goldsmiths should follow the Hoopers; 10 and 11 have no significance as following 9; 12 is, perhaps, possible, but what of 13 and 14?

Again, the description of the pageants would apply much more aptly to fixed tableaux than to plays. In only one is any action implied, and that is the singing of an angel. Still, the objection may be offered that the descriptions of several of the plays in the York cycle would also apply more aptly to tableaux, but that we have the plays. This must be admitted, and in my opinion either there were with some of the York pageants representations accompanying the pageant wagon, such as paintings on flags, or, as seems more probable, the actors themselves posed in tableaux, as the pageant passed from station to station. I cannot otherwise explain such descriptions as, in York v, "Adam et Eva et arbor inter eos"; in xi, "Moyses exaltans serpentem in deserto, Pharaon Rex, viii Judei admirantes et expectantes," and many others. Such evidences only illustrate the fact to which we have elsewhere, in royal entries and in processions, abundant testimony, that to the mediæval mind pageantry, fixed or movable tableaux, was as important and interesting a show as the spoken play.

But the Dublin processional pageants do not stand alone. They are illustrated by the pageants in the Aberdeen Candlemas procession in the "Offerand of Our Lady," miscalled a play by Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith in 'York Mystery Plays,' p. 1xv. For this procession the 'Records of Aberdeen, Spaulding Club,' p. 451, under the date of May 22d, 1531, gives the following:

"The flescharis, Sanct Bestian and his Tormentouris.
The barbouris, Sanct Lowrance and his Tormentouris.
The skinnaris, Sanct Martyne and his Tormentouris.
The taylieouris, the Coronatioun of Our Lady.
Litstaris, Sanct Nicholes.
Wobstaris, walcaris, and bonet makaris,
Sanct John.
Baxtaris, Sanct Georg.
Wrichtis, messonis, sclateris, and cuparis,
The Resurrectioun.
The smithis and hammirmen to furneiss
The Bearmen of the Croce."

The records of Aberdeen shed more light upon tableaux of this character than do those of Dublin. We can trace them from 1442 to 1531, nearly a century, and observe their changes. The earlier series show more signs of an originally cyclic construction, but at no stage are they as near the primitive type as are those of Dublin, however much they may aid us to an understanding of the latter.

The tableau mystery is the *mystère mimé* of the French, and can be best studied on French soil. The Bethune pageants of 1549, as given by Petit de Julleville in 'Les Mystères,' vol. ii, p. 212-13, although greatly outnumbering those of any procession in England, retain fully the cyclic form, beginning with the Annunciation and closing with the Judgment. The earliest one recorded was exhibited at Paris before Edward ii, in 1313; and of a mute mystery of stationary pageants, in 1420, representing in connected story the Passion, it is said by the same author that it was "a bas-relief of living figures counterfeiting a bas-relief of stone."

From these instances it can readily be seen that these connected pageants at first presented to the eye a mystery play in tableaux, but later legendary and allegorical subjects intruded, breaking the sequence and destroying the cycle. The Dublin pageants have departed but a step from the cyclic form, the Aberdeen

have gone much further. Nevertheless, this step the Dublin pageants have taken, and they could not have done so had they been spoken plays.

Another proof of the tableau character of these pageants lies in the fact that they were apparently soon abandoned by the gilds of Dublin. We do not find that cycle plays were ever easily discarded. They were costly. Entries of expenditure upon them are frequent in the gild account books, and the city records abound in regulations concerning their presentation, and in acts for the relief of weak gilds. A tableau pageant might be more easily displaced by another, or discarded, as was often the case in royal entries and elsewhere. The evidence that the Dublin gilds soon dropped the pageants from their procession is found in this statement by the authority already quoted. I give the substance of it, not the exact words. In 1541 the procession of Corpus Christi at Dublin was similar to other processions, without pageants, but was followed by the play of the Nine Worthies.

But if the Corpus Christi pageants were tableaux, what about the Dublin play of Abraham and Isaac, which is extant? The records again offer us an explanation. In 1528, according to the above-named authority, certain crafts in Dublin acted plays during Christmas week before certain high officials. Each day one craft presented a play which was chosen for some supposed reference to the occupation of the craft; thus the tailors played Adam and Eve; the shoemakers, Crispin and Crispianus; the vintners, Bacchus and his story; the carpenters, Joseph and Mary; the smiths, Vulcan and what related to him; the bakers, a comedy of Ceres, the goddess of corn. The Priors of St. John of Jerusalem, of the Blessed Trinity, and of All-Hallows put upon the stage, the one the Passion of our Savior, the others the several deaths which the Apostles suffered. If, now, the play of the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem, or that of the carpenters, were extant, wherein would it differ from the play of Abraham and Isaac? Would not the presumption in favor of a cycle be as strong as with the play in question?

In view of the fact that the mystery play was the form that most occasional plays took

at that time, and that the customary entertainment at any festivity was such a play, I think we are forced to accept this "Abraham and Isaac" as one of the multitude of occasional plays that were fashioned so easily on the model of existing plays.

Upon the same page ten Brink also makes this statement:

"Gehen wir von Chester südwards durch die wallisische Mark, so treffen wir, dem Lauf des Severn folgend, auf die Städte Shrewsbury, Worcester, Tewkesbury, deren Namen alle drei, wenn auch nicht an hervorragender Stelle, in den Annalen des englischen Dramas verzeichnet sind."

This statement occurs in the midst of a discussion of mystery plays, and is misleading so far as concerns Shrewsbury. The only evidence that I have found for plays at Shrewsbury is contained in Fosbroke's 'Encyclopædia of Antiquities,' ed. 1843, vol. ii, p. 665. This states that in 1574 at Shrewsbury a stage-play was acted in the High Street by the players of the Earl of Essex. How do we know that this was a mystery play? These companies of players did not at that date customarily act mystery plays. Further, if the plays acted by companies under the patronage of some noble are to be considered, why stop with Shrewsbury? Whenever the plague, or any other cause, interrupted their entertainments in London, these companies sought the provinces and played wherever they could make a shilling. These plays were legion, but are not, as I understand the term, to be classed under mystery plays.

CHARLES DAVIDSON.

Belmont School, California.

ETYMOLOGIES.

I. OLD FRENCH *Plevir*.

THE difficulties surrounding the etymology of *plevir* and its Romance and English cognates have often been discussed and several impossible derivations have been suggested: cf. Diez, 'Wb.,' Littré, 'Dict.,' and other literature in Mackel: "Die Germanischen Elemente in der französischen und provenzalischen Sprache."

The last-named writer is apparently on the right track when he recognizes the reflex of a

Germanic *pleu* in the *v* of the Romance words; but failing to see the exact nature and inter-relation of the Germanic forms, he is unable to account for the *u* as well as for the *i* of *plevir*. It is not *plaihvan* nor *plāwun*, *plewan* that we need, but *pleujan*. Now, this is in keeping with the formative principles and phonetic laws of Germanic and it alone suffices to account for *plevir*.

Indo-European root *blegh*—thus Sütterlin, *Bezenberger's Beiträge* xvii, p. 163, but *bleg* with simple *tenuis* is, perhaps, more probable—Greek *βλέπω*, Latin *SU-BULCUS*, *BU-BULCUS*, gives Germanic *plehw*, which, according to Verner's law, alternates with *plegw*, and the latter according to Sievers' law becomes *pleu*. Germanic *plegan* owes its *g* to secondary influence of weak forms ending in *u*.—Idg. *bleq*: Germanic *plegan-pleujan* from *ple(g)wjan* is exactly like Idg. *og*: Germanic *augōn*—Anglo-Saxon *ƿjan* from *au(g)wjan*.

II. JACOBUS—JAIMES, JAMES, GIACOMO, ETC.

In *Jaimes* and its Romance cognates and English derivatives, we find an *m* instead of the etymological *b* of *Jacobus*. The only similar interchange that is known to me, occurs in *samedi* < *SABBATI DIEM*. However, in *samedi* we recognize not only in the *m*, but also in the vocalism the influence of *SEPTIMUM DIEM*, *se (p)me di*, 'seventh day.' Moreover, as Kluge shows in his beautiful work on the pre-historic condition of the Germanic languages in Paul's 'Grundriss' i, 319, there existed a Greek Arrian *βαμβάτος* which has left its traces in many languages, and which may also in the North of Gaul have helped to develop a nasalized *samedi*. Thus *Jaimes* remains alone; and here, too, the *m* must be due to some outside influence. The latter will easily be recognized in the numerous Graeco-Latin and Romance names ending in *-mus*, *-mes*: Chrysostomus, Didymus, Zosymus, Hieronymus, Onesymus, Oekonomus; in addition to these there were adjectives ending in *-mus* which were largely used as proper names: Optumus, Maxumus; perhaps even *dominūs* (often preceding our word as a title), may have influenced its form. It is, then, to a psychological motive, 'Suffixvertauschung,' not to a physiological sound-change, that the *m* of *Jaimes*, etc., is due.

III. GERMANIC *slehta*.

Gothic *slaihts*, O.N. *sléttir* from **slehtaR*, O.H.G. *sléht*—the English *slight* is probably a Netherlandish borrowing, cf. Kluge, 'Wb.'—are *-to* derivatives from √Germanic *slīk*, I.-E. *slīg*; the original meaning is 'smoothed, even, straight,' thence 'plain, vulgar,' etc. We have here one more case of a root in *ī* having developed forms with *ž*, as a result of 'breaking.' While the conditions of this breaking are not yet known in all cases, the law is well established before *r* and *h*; cf. now on the subject of breaking, Kluge in Paul's 'Grundriss' i, 355.

IV. ENGLISH *dear*, GERMAN *teuer*.

Old-English *dýrre*, O.N. *dýrr*, O.H.G. *tiuri* + *tūr* reflect a Germanic *deurja-* < *deura-*, *dūra-*. This cannot be anything else but I.-E. *dheuro-dhūro-*. In the latter I recognize a *-ro* derivative from the root *dhū*. The formal correspondence is perfectly correct, nor does the meaning offer any difficulty. Root *dhū* means originally 'motion, emotion, excitement'; and we can understand the limitation of such neutral meaning in *bonam partem* as well as we recognize the opposite in Lat. *furor*, partly in Greek *θυμός*, 'anger.' *Dhūro-* 'excitement, astonishment, admiration,' cf. *θαύμα*, *θαυμάζω*, thence *dheurjo-* 'admirable,' yields very naturally the basis for the Germanic meanings: 'valuable, beloved' and by an interesting shifting which has taken place in historical times on German soil, *bedauern* = 'regret.' The development of a neutral term, a 'vox media' either in *bonam* or *malam partem* has numerous analoga; cf. *fortuna*, *luck*, *chance*; German *schön*, *gefallen* and many others. First specified by a determinative expression accompanying them, they gradually were limited to the same specified meaning, then the specifying term seemed useless and was omitted. More examples illustrating the same process will be found in the next number of Sievers' (*Paul und Braune*) *Beiträge* under "*Senne*."

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

BRANT UND ERASMUS.

BEZUGNEHMEND auf meinen Aufsatz in der Februar- und Märznummer der MOD. LANG.

NOTES über Brant und Erasmus sei es mir gestattet, zwei Proben aus Brant's profanen Narrentypen anzuführen, die erweisen mögen, in welcher Weise Erasmus die Anregung mancher Gedanken aus seiner Quelle schöpfte, aber in der Ausführung derselben völlig original blieb. Erasmus ist auch hierin 'ein Mann für sich.'

BRANT, NS. Cap. lxxiv.

ERASMUS, 'Encomium.'

Mancher vil kost uf jagen leit,
das im doch wenig nutz usz-dreit,
wie wol er dick ein weid-spruch seit.

Von unnutzem jagen.

Jagen ist ouch on narrheit nit,
vil zit vertribt man on nutz mit;
wil woles sin sol ein kurz-wil,
so darf es dannah kostens vil;

darzû darf man vil herter zit,
wie man im nochlouf, gang und rit,
und sücht all berg, tal, wäld und heck,
do man verhag, wart und versteck;

die buren jagen in dem schne;
der adel hat kein vorteil me,
wan er dem wiltpret lang nochlouft,
so hats der bur heimlich ver-kouft.

Nembroht zûm erst fing jagen an,
dan er von got was ganz ver-lan;

Esau der jagt, um das er was ein s:nder und der gots ver-gasz.

wenig jüger als Humpertus
findt man ietz und Eustachius. . . .

Ad hunc ordinem (i. e. *stultorum*) pertinent et isti, qui prae venatu ferarum omnia contemnunt, atque incredibilem amini voluptatem percipere se praedicant, quoties foedum illum cornuum cantum audierint, quoties canum eiulatus. . . . Deinde quae suavitatis, quoties fera lanianda est! Tauros et vervecos humili plebi laniare licet, feram nisi a generoso secari nefas. . . . Porro cui contigerit, e bellua nonnihil gustare, is vero existimat, sibi non parum nobilitatis accedere. Itaque quum isti assidua ferarum insectatione atque esu nihil aliud assequantur, nisi ut ipsi prope-modum in feras degenerent, tamen interea regiam vitam agere se putant.

Der Unterschied zwischen Erasmus und Brant ist der, dass ersterer auf den demoralisierenden, verrohenden Einfluss der Hetzjagden hinweist, dem sich gerade der Adel hingiebt, letzterer hingegen an dem Jagen an sich moralisch nichts Tadelnswertes findet. Nur hält er es für eine Torheit, "vil zit on nutz mit zu vertriben," grosse Kosten auf die "kurzwil" zu verwenden, sich der Mühseligkeit des

Jagens zu unterziehen, zumal der Bauer, gegen den Brant überhaupt ein Häkchen hat,* dem Adel oft genug den Vorteil wegschnappt. Freilich die grossen biblischen Jäger, Nimrod und Esau, wurden von Gott verlassen, weil auch sie, von der Jagerei in Anspruch genommen, seiner vergassen. Hubertus und Eustachius-Placidus führten trotz ihres Jägerhandwerks ein heiliges Leben.

Seinen Jägernarren lässt Erasmus die Bauern unmittelbar folgen, die ins Wesen hinein Bauten aufführen, welche weit über die ihnen zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel gehen. Es kann keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass die Quelle für den Gedanken in Brant's NS., Cap. xv, zu suchen ist.

BRANT, NS. Cap. xv.

Wer buwen wil, der schlag
vor an,
was kostens er darzu müsz
han,
er würt sunst vor dem end
abstan.

Von narrechtem anslag.

Der ist ein narr, der buwen
wil
und nit vorhin anschlecht
wie vil
das kosten werd, und ob er
mag
vollbringen solchs, noch sim
ansschlag.
vil hant grosz buw geschla-
gen an
und müchent nit darbi be-
stan.

(Beispiele: Nabuchodonosor, Nimrod.)

wer buwen wil, das in nit
ruw;
der bdenk sich wol, e dann
er buw;
dann manchem kumt sin ruw
zu spat,
so im der schad in seckel
gat.
wer etwas gross wil under-
stan,
der soll sin selbst bewerung
han
ober mög künmen zu dem stat,
den er im für genomen hat,
domit im nit ein gluck züfall

*Vide lxxiii, Zeile 4-6: "on arbeit leb und sig ein her"; lxxii, Z. 47: "der adel hat kein vorteil me." (Bauern-
dinkel).

und werd zu spot den men-
schen all,
vil weger ist, nüt understan,
dann mit schad, schand, ge-
spöt ablan.

HERMANN SCHÖNFELD.

Johns Hopkins University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Pepton's Glasse OF Time. 12mo, pp. xxxvii, 177. New York: JOHN B. ALDEN, 1891.

THIS quaint and attractive volume was published during the reign of James I. of England, the first part appearing in 1620, the second in 1623. There is a copy of the original edition in the library of the British Museum and in the library of Harvard College. For a long period the book seems to have faded out of memory, being forgotten even by scholars and specialists. More than thirty years ago, the *North American Review* (October, 1860), advocated the publication of a new edition, but not until recent times did the suggestion meet with a cordial response, and result in preserving to the scholar of our day this pleasing memorial of a time almost contemporary with Shakespeare, and fully contemporary with Bacon, Ben Jonson, and the youthful days of Milton. A well-known gentleman of Staunton, Va., who is endowed with keen æsthetic sympathy and genuine literary discernment, is to be credited with the publication of the volume in its present form, he having reproduced the work during a sojourn in England from the original copy in the British Museum. Much of the interest of the book lies in the fact that its theme is identical with that of Milton's 'Paradise Lost,'—the creation, temptation, and fall of man. The riming verse in which it is written would have incurred the disapprobation of Milton in his later days, when his aversion to the beggarly bondage of riming had become thoroughly fixed and established. We can see no sufficient reason for assuming that the 'Glass of Time' was one of the prototypes or models of 'Paradise Lost.' The claims advanced in the same direction for Cædmon and Vondel are not satisfactory or convincing. However ingenious the argument, or however marked the likenesses that may be pointed

out, in conception or in phraseology, Milton's latter day reprobation of rime, except under special conditions, as well as the circumstance that the theme of his great epic is many centuries older in English literature alone than Peyton's era, is a sufficient refutation. Despite this concession, the charm of the book is rare, and it affords a rich field for the elucidation of English literature during the first quarter of the xvii. century. We purpose to notice its characteristics of style, not that they are exclusively peculiar to the writer, but on account of their illustrative value to the student of our linguistic development during the age of 'wise Bacon' and 'brave Raleigh.' The Dedications to James I., Prince Charles, and the Lord Chancellor Bacon, are in point of merit above the typical style of the time, and of later times as well.

The edition of the book before us contains all that is definitely known in regard to the life and work of Peyton. He was a Royalist in politics, an Anglican in religion, a lawyer by profession. He died in 1626, the death year of Bacon, at the age of thirty one, before he had completed his work in accordance with the original design. Milton was then a lad of eighteen and was seeking inspiration from the Galahads and Percivals of the Arthurian myth, rather than from the story of man's first disobedience.

Let us note some of the characteristic forms and usages that mark the author's language; they appeal to the student from the philological, as well as the literary point of view.

In Part i, Stanza 4, we find the verb *conster* to create or produce consternation.

"And as a foul mishapen pointed monster
Conceit of her as all the world doth *conster*."

The word *cashier* had not in Peyton's time acquired its exclusively technical or specialized sense, as is illustrated in the following examples: it was tending towards it, as may be seen from "Othello" I, i, 48, and from other familiar Shakesperian passages.

Stanza 8, Part i:

"The angel which against the Lord did swell,
He quite *cashiered* and cast him down to hell."

Stanza 73, Part i:

"*Cashier* them both out of that lovely place,
To die a death in miserable case."

Baine as a verb to prove a bane or injury.

Stanza 78, Part i:

"Alas, weake man what can it do thee good
To know the tree that thus has *bained* thy blood?"

Also Stanza 78, Part i:

"Still to this day maintaining errors plaine,
To tell the fruite that thus themselves did *baine*."

Minion has its characteristic Elizabethan and French sense of *favorite*, *darling*. Stanza 14, Part i:

"Now tell me Rome that thinkst thyself the *minion*,
Christ's only Vicar in thine own opinion."

Hoddy Loddy. Stanza 4, Part i:

"But to God's people should remaine no rest
That toyle and travell painfull works always,
And *Hoddy Loddy*, Topsy Turvey play."

Puritant is the characteristic form for Puritan.

Stanza 59, Part i:

"The *Puritant* he is again as nice
As those uncivill in their clamorous vice."

See also stanza 123, Part i; Stanza 160, Part ii.

Azed. Stanza 161, Part i:

"In all the world how well I may compare,
To *azed* Enoch walking in the air."

Venter. Stanza 19, Part ii; also Stanza 24, Part ii:

"Or like a man that *venters* for a prize,
Hood winckt and made starke blind in both eyes."

The form *venter* survives in provincial usage.

Urcked. Stanza 20, Part ii:

"Even so is Adam in that *urcked* place,
The flaming sword still blazing in his face."

Amates. Stanza 20, Part ii:

"The radiant splendor of the Cherubims,
Dazles, *amates*, his tender eyesight dims."

Also Stanza 161, Part ii:

"*Amates* his mind and scared conscience pricks."

Labroious. Stanza 41, Part ii:

"When the dear painful wise *labroious* Bee,
Ten thousand ways about heavens blossoms flee."

Simulize. Stanza 69, Part ii:

"False hypocrite how canst thou *simulize*
Before my face thy actions foul disguise."

Bespaked. Stanza 69, Part ii:

"Why is thy soul thus pestered with a sore,
Rankled, *bespaked*, like a rotten core."

Partialize. Stanza 72, Part ii:

"No outward form can make thee *partialize*,
Thou lookst upon the inward sacrifice."

Gurnes=*grins*, a word familiar to students of Elizabethan literature. Stanza 74, Part ii:

"Whilst those returned like to a dog that *gurns*,
That back againe unto his vomit turns."

For an example of the word in modern literature, see Browning's "Old Pictures in Florence," stanza 9.

"And here where your praise might yield returns,
And a handsome word or two give help,
Here, after your kind, the mastiff *gurns*,
And the puppy pack of poodles yelp."

In Part ii, Stanza 83, we have a proximate parallel to a well-known Tennysonian passage:

"Even then he *takes occasion by her lock*,
Singles forth Habel from his harmless flock."

See Tennyson's "Dedication to the Queen," stanza 8.

"And statesmen at her council met,
Who knew the seasons when *to take*
Occasion by the hand and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet."

In Part ii, Stanza 116, we have an example of the rhematic *to* which is by no means common in Elizabethan English.

"That she shall be the object of his eye,
His darling deare from her to *never flye*."

Foretype used as a verb, see "Dedication to the Lord Chancellor Bacon," stanza 1; also Stanza 170, Part ii:

"The King himself (T'immortalize thy fame)
Hath in thy name *foretyped* out the same."

The student of Tennyson will recall the use of *type* as a verb in "In Memoriam," section 118, stanza 4:

"Who throve and branched from clime to clime,
The herald of a higher race,
And of himself in higher place,
If so he *type* this work of time."

The varied learning, classical, legal, historical, biblical, that Peyton condenses into his volume, excites our admiration, especially when we bear in mind that it was the work of a mere youth who did not live to bring it to perfection or maturity. We recall the achievements of Sackville, author of "The Induction,"

joint author of "Gorboduc," who prepared the way for the incoming glory of Marlowe, and himself abandoned literature for a political career, at the dawning age of twenty-six.

That Peyton was familiar with the Faust legend is evident from stanza 79, Part ii. Historical allusions, such as that to Elizabeth of Bohemia, stanza 143, Part i, forms like *pester*, *bepester*, which survive in America, words such as the Elizabethan *adust*, *idolize* in the sense of committing or practising idolatry, stanza 145, Part ii, require no comment or detailed explanation. It has been my purpose to point out such forms and expressions as are characteristic of the author and his epoch; whatever is merely general and not distinctive, has been, for the most part, ignored.

That Peyton's 'Glasse of Time,' in any marked degree influenced Milton's supreme epic, as to choice of theme, or mode of treatment, is a claim that cannot be made good by scientific analysis, or by any of the processes recognized by the student of comparative literature. Even with this abatement the work has the charm of strong individuality, as well as a rare vocabulary, and is worthy of revival in an age abounding in literary resurrections. For the special investigator of the Elizabethan and Jacobean time, it has a unique attraction. We cordially acknowledge the kindly offices of our Virginia friend, whose cultured tastes and sympathies have been instrumental in rousing it from the long slumber during which it came perilously near to complete oblivion.

HENRY E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston.

ULRICH VON HUTTEN.

Ulrichs von Hutten Deutsche Schriften. Untersuchung nebst einer Nachlese von SIEGFRIED SZAMATÓLSKI. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1891. (*Quellen und Forschungen*, No. 67).

AMONG the many interesting figures which greet us on the threshold of modern German history, there is none—even Luther not excepted—more attractive than that of the scholar-knight with the laurel of the poet, the valiant champion of Humanism and the Reformation, Ulrich von Hutten.

For him more than for any of his contemporaries, life was a continual struggle. Sent to the monastery when a child, to become a monk according to the will of his father, he escaped and suffered all the hardships and privations of utmost poverty and a severe, tedious and almost hopeless sickness, and yet he never fell away from manliness, never did his indomitable fortitude and courage abandon themselves to despair, and all his writings are full of spirit and vigor.

It is this which conquers our sympathy for the pugnacious knight who entered with fervor into the battle for the political and religious liberty of his beloved country, and fought in it with a noble recklessness as to the consequences that might arise from it for his own person. Indeed, whatever Hutten's faults may have been—and he had faults—nobody can reproach him with littleness or insincerity of character, and when we see him as far removed from Luther's narrow-mindedness as from Reuchlin's or Erasmus' faint-heartedness, we understand that Eoban Hesse, at the news of his death exclaimed: *Eras totus amabilis*.

As Strauss states in his excellent biography* "the nurse of Hutten's genius was indignation." Indeed from that midwinter-day (December, 1509) when the poor poet had been robbed by his enemies of his warm clothing, to that letter in which Hutten commissions his friend Eoban Hesse to get his work against tyrants printed (July 21, 1523), from the very beginning of his literary career to the 'Swan song' on his death bed, it is always indignation that lent his pen its greatest strength and most brilliant colors. It is significant for this quality of Hutten's mind that even in the renowned 'Epistles of the Obscure Men,' which seem all jokes and jests and fun, the part attributed to our knight betrays more earnestness, showing the pathos beneath the irony: he never forgets that injustice and stupidity must not only be ridiculed, but also combated.

And the more important the objects are which call forth his indignation, the more his writings increase in vigor. In the 'Querelae' he takes revenge on his personal enemies for

their brutality; the 'Orations against Duke Ulrich of Würtemberg' and 'Phalarismus' show the chivalrous knight as the advocate of his family, calling to account the hot-headed murderer of his cousin. In the 'Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum,' he embraces the cause of humanism against the ignorance and stupidity of scholasticism. The highest point of literary merit, however, is reached in his writings on the great questions of the time; never is Hutten more eloquent, never does he speak with more effective pathos and power of persuasion, than when he sends forth his rhetorical thunderbolts against the Romish supremacy in Germany, which he regarded as the root of all evil, and which he held responsible for the ecclesiastical and political distress in his fatherland.

It appears from this characteristic of Hutten's literary work, that he could take but a very slight interest in purely religious matters; to tell the truth, he was too deeply permeated with the humanistic indifference to all dogmatic questions to pay any attention to Luther's 'theological quarrel.'

Not until he saw that Luther, from different premises, had reached the same conclusions, did Hutten espouse his cause and become the 'guardian of the evangelical doctrine,' the 'champion of the word of God.'

We should not forget, however, that the keynote of Hutten's sentiments was the desire to win for Germany political liberty and independence from Rome; to do away with the political leading-strings by which the Pope held the Emperor and the fatherland; to put an end to all papal exertions and aggressions. And it is in pursuing this object that Hutten's writings show a warmth and, sometimes, vehemence of language which come from the inmost depths of his manly and vigorous mind. It is noteworthy that, even in 1521, Hutten does not know a better title for himself than the 'Champion of German liberty,' as we find it on the title-page of the 'Bull-Slayers.' To carry out his patriotic schemes, such as he had set forth in his 'Address to the Turks' (1518), he even brought himself to lay aside long-cherished prejudices. In order that the Empire may be re-established in its mediæval glory, all classes of the people must make

*Translated into English by Mrs. G. Sturge, London, 1874.

sacrifices, especially the princes, for unity and unconditioned obedience to the Emperor are the two things most needful. And when the princes refused to coöperate and continued to pursue their selfish interests, Hutten proffered his hand to the burghers whom he had formerly so despised, and advocated an alliance between the nobles and the cities, to effect the religious and political reforms. It is the dialogue entitled 'The Robbers' (1521) that marks this turning point in Hutten's ideas and projects. But before the proud knight succeeded in throwing aside his class prejudices, he had already conquered those of his literary traditions as a humanist, which would not allow him to write in German. Hutten always claimed—and with good reasons—that he "had, before Luther, opposed papal tyranny, revealed the papal imposture, annihilated the power of bulls, closed Germany against indulgences and all such jugglery."

We may even attribute to his 'Vadiscus' a decisive influence on Luther's resolution to renounce the Pope, since this manifesto against Rome appeared in April 1520, and Luther's work on the 'Babylonish Captivity of the Church' not until October of the same year. It has hitherto been a generally accepted opinion that Hutten did not begin to write German until after the publication of Luther's 'Address to the German Christian nobles.' Mr. Szamatólski, however, proves in his very interesting book that while no German writings were published under Hutten's name before 1520, Hutten had certainly commenced to write in German before that date, and some of his writings had even been published, although anonymously.

It seems strange that Strauss, as well as Mr. Szamatólski, forget to connect the name of Sickingen with Hutten's change from Latin to German. Mr. Szamatólski proves that Hutten, as early as February 1519, wrote the translation of 'Febris i' for this newly-won friend and protector; as this is his first German work, the conjecture does not appear too bold that the intercourse with Sickingen, who knew but little Latin, first suggested to Hutten the idea of writing in German. To this powerful and hardy knight, who then had given him shelter at Ebernburg, Hutten also dedicated in 1520

the translation of his four dialogues 'Febris i and ii,' 'Vadiscus' and 'the Spectators.'

The great merit of Mr. Szamatólski's book, besides its valuable stylistic researches, is that it shows for the first time the relation and mutual influence of Hutten's German work and the development of his political opinions. For, in opposition to the current opinion, Mr. Szamatólski proves that Hutten's resolution to write in German was not so abrupt and accidental as it has hitherto been regarded: 'When Hutten in the fall of 1520 brandishes the sword of his native tongue against his adversaries, he does not handle a weapon to which he is unaccustomed and which he has only snatched up in the fury of the battle, but a well-tested one, which he has chosen and prepared in time for the great fight.'

This is the well-founded conclusion at which Mr. Szamatólski arrives. Mr. Szamatólski, however, offers not only a literary vindication of Hutten, whose German work had not met with due appreciation before, but also the knight's apparent wavering up to the time of, and during, the diet of Worms is explained. After what has been said about Hutten's indifference to purely theological matters, we may easily understand how immediately before Luther's coming to Worms, Hutten was ready to exert his personal influence upon the great reformer, to make him revoke his open and much-condemned attacks upon the Catholic creed.

There is one more word to be said about the *Pfaffenkrieg*. Mr. Szamatólski explains the development of the idea of such a war from its first conception, after Hutten had heard that he had been placed on the Roman list of proscription, down to the real outbreak of hostilities of the fatal conclusion of the diet of Worms. Hutten, in whom the author and the knight were contending with each other all his life, tried to organize from his friend's castles, besides the spiritual warfare, an actual campaign against the emissaries and adherents of Rome, and it is shown by the reports of the nuncio how great an importance was attributed to his threats, apparently backed by the power of Franz von Sickingen. But the latter refused to coöperate with Hutten in his projects of force, and so Hutten saw himself alone in the very moment when he had

meant to draw the sword, immediately before the opening of the diet, and he had again to take up the pen and to adapt himself to the different, constantly changing, phases of the discussions and transactions at Worms. After Luther's departure from the diet, Hutten proceeded to the execution of his long-cherished plans, and looked at from this point of view, the feuds from the fall of 1521 to the fall of 1522 appear no longer in the light of petty personal quarrels, in which he gave vent to his ill humor at the failure of his great schemes; they form part of his great 'war against the priests.' In the last years of his life, Hutten's fate is closely connected with that of the ambitious lord of Ebernburg. It was Sickingen who induced him, in the spring of 1520, to give up all at once his dreams of a simple and peaceful life as a scholar and to enter into the open arena of politics. And with the downfall of Sickingen, all the hopes of Hutten were destroyed. Whatever may have been the real motives of Sickingen's attack on the Elector of Treves, we cannot doubt that it appeared to Hutten as Sickingen's final espousal of his own political schemes. "The campaign was not undertaken," as the address to the troops and allies says,

"to increase the Renish knight's wealth or power, but for God's honor, for it was directed against the enemies of the Gospels, the bishops and priests."

The princes, however, considered the expedition as a dangerous attack on their power on the part of the nobles, and so Hutten's safety was no longer endangered by the Romanists only, but also by the princes who persecuted in him one of the most active instigators of this revolt against their rule. He was compelled to leave Germany and take shelter in Switzerland, where he died in the utmost poverty on one of the last days of August, or the first of September, 1523.

MAX BLAU.

Boston.

ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLES.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicles from 800-1001 A.D.

Edited, with introduction, notes and a complete glossary, by J. F. DAVIS, D.Lit., M.A. (Lond.). London: Whittaker & Co., 1889. 8vo, viii+102 pp.

Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel (787-1001 A.D.) with supplementary extracts from the others. A Revised Text. Edited, with introduction, critical notes, and glossary by CHARLES PLUMMER, M.A., etc. On the basis of an edition by John Earle, M.A., etc. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889. 8vo, xvi+136 pp.

THESE two little books are designed primarily to meet the needs of students reading for the London University B.A. examination, but will be found admirably adapted to the purposes of beginners in Old English, by reason not only of the ease and purity of the material, but also because of the convenient shape in which it is presented. So much being premised it remains to notice them both in detail.

The introduction of Dr. Davis occupies itself with the sources of the annals, the mode and origin of their compilation, the sources of the text, the character of the present edition—all in four pages. The student will rise from its perusal with only the vaguest idea of the subject; and it would have been better to devote the page and a half given to a succinct account of all the MSS. to a more extended description of A. and E., their relative values and contents, since on these two MSS. alone the text is based. *þ* in the list of contractions is to be corrected to *þ̄*. The table of abbreviations on page vii would be more convenient if printed on p. 76 where it properly belongs.

The text is based on A. and E. exclusively, the aim being to present a "full account of the period from 800-1001 as far as the events are recorded in the MSS. A. and E." The text is fair and distinct, accents being those of the MSS. only. A careful collation with Earle and Plummer presents the following variations and errors:

P. 1, l. 11. *Steall*; *Steal* P. E.—p. 15, 26, *cuomon*; so E., *comon* P.—19, 7. *paer* *é*; read *paer[e]* *é* with P.—20, 11. *enforan*; misprint for *onforan*—21, 24. *Alfred*; so E. *Aelfred*, P.—23, 16. *Aepered, waes*; read *Aepered [se]* *waes*, if [*se*] be permissible at 24, 13; if not omit both as P. E. have neither—24, 26. read 910 (E). *And her*, with E. and P.—25, 12. *Eowils*; *Ecwils* P. E.—25, 33. *Mercaena*; *Myrcena*, P. E.—26, 31. *Eadwearde* is contrary to syntax and P. E.; omit the final *e*.—28, 31. *teonan*; so E. but *teonun*, P. as cited in glossary also—29, 1.

foran; *foron*, P. E.—31,18. *sweoda*; misprint for *sweorda*.—31,19. *Brunanburh*; so E. *Brunanburh* P., also Wülker in 'K.A.D.' and the revised Grein, the latter with the remark *undeutlich*.—32,10. *heardes*; *heeardes*, E. P.—32,20. *cread cneor on*, with MSS. B. C. and Wheloc, Wülker (G.² and 'K.A.D.'), Ettm. G.¹, Rieger, Körner; *cread cnearen*, E. P.—32,28. *forgrunden*. MSS. B.C.D. with Wheloc and Wülker (G.² and 'K.A.D.').; *fergrunden*. P. E.—33,25. 940; 941 P.E. rightly; see P. note on 893.—33,26. xl; xli P. E.—33,31. 941; 942 P. E.—34,9. No good reason occurs to the reviewer why the parts of annal 941 should be separated as by Dr. Davis. Such separation mutilates the text. Join 943 (A) with 941 (A) as with E. P. Wülker (G.² 'K.A.D.') and read,

*afera Eadweardes, Edmund cyning,
on feng Anlufe cyninge etc.*

This may spoil the looks of the poem, but is conformable to the MSS.—34,18. *eal to*; *to cal*, P. E.—35,6. [*And . . . laude*]; so E. with MS. F., but P. follows A. dating the entry 956.—35,8. [*Her . . . Lundene*]; so E. but P. with MSS. A. F. 959—36,17. *uigila*; *uigilia*, P. E. also Davis in glos.—48,10. Annal number 1001 omitted.—48,15. *Aepelward*; misprint for *Aepelward*.—49,3. *elaf*; read *fela*.

Five hundred and forty-two notes are given to 1583 lines; of these three hundred and seventy-six are perfectly dispensable. The very dullest beginner does not need notes like 45,22. *wið heora feondum*, 'From their foes'; 46,8. *cumon=cuman*; 43,22. *an=on*; 41,24. *wide gefrege*='widely known.' Such notes serve only to make the student' lazier. Cross references should not be given so frequently. Repetition of notes affect memories; yet we are told the use of *healf* in five separate notes; 16,18. is referred to three times; 22,1, 22,3, 22,19, etc., seven times. Only fifteen notes are over four lines long; only twenty-eight are over three lines; the large majority are only one line in length. Real difficulties are not met; and we are surprised to find no notes on annal 852 E. as a whole; the genealogies in 855; the list of Bretwaldas in 827; the recording of eclipses, comets, on 802 *sequens*; *pallium*. 804; *Angelcynnes Scolu* in 816 with 894; 823, *fierd* should be distinguished from *here*; 853, office and duties of *wiotan*;

the two poems, 937 and 941; the procedure narrated in 963 E., the rights and privileges granted, etc. The space given to three hundred and seventy-six picayune notes might well have been used in the elucidation of these matters.

In the glossary we have to notice the following: *Acennan*, 'to beget, bear,' not 'to be born'; *Aduent* is not 'the first Sunday in Advent,' see 963 E; *Aeglea*, to 'see note,' add: p. 57; *aepel*, read *aepel*; *anstraces*, read *anstreces*, see p. 19; after *behienan*, 'add *behindan*'; *beom* should follow *beorht*; after *betweox* add *bewuna* (see 1001) and strike out *wuna* altogether; *bilgebleht*, misprint for *bilgesleht*; insert *bradbrim* (937 A); *Bretwalda* . . see note, add p. 52; insert *Battington* (894), *Calu* (978); *Clofeshoo*, see note, add p. 52; *crism-lising* . . see notes, add p. 58; *cyneg* (1001 A), *cynincg* (1001 A) are variants of *cyning* and should be given; insert *diacon*, (963 A), *engel*, 'angel' (975); *epeltyrf*, read *turf*, *yin* 875 because dative; *faege*, strike out 'slain'; *feax* omit as only in *blandenfeax* (837); add *feowertig* (894); *forgiueness*, omit final s; add *forhræpe*, adv. 'quickly' (921); *From*, a river (955); *gewildan*, read *gewealdan*; omit *gifa*, only in comp. *beahgifa*; add *gold*. (1001 A); om. *hafoc*, only in *guphafoc*; add *hasupad* (937 A); *Hwicium* . . see note, add p. 51; *Iglea* omit; *Lidwicium*, . . see note, add p. 59; *Limen*. add p. 60; omit *hacela*, and add *maessehacela* (963 E.); omit *plega*, only in *hondplega*; omit *ring*, only in *hildering*; *sacu*, add p. 70; add *saendan* see *sendan*; omit *sleht*, *steort*, *stream* only in comps.; *team*, p. 70; add *tocnawlece*, 'expressly' (963 E.), *pencan* (921), *ungeþwaerns* (867), *waest* (see *weast*); *wealhgefera* add p. 63; *wealwudu* add p. 57; *Wirhcalas* also in sg. at 895.

We expected more careful and accurate work from the translator of Kluge, and hope these errors will be corrected in the second edition the book deserves. Barring these, teachers will find this volume quite useful and convenient in elementary work.

The book of Mr. Plummer is part of a larger work; namely, a complete recasting of the edition of Prof. Earle, published in 1865 and now out of print. We have here the well-known features of the edition of Earle, the two

main texts in parallel columns, the supplementary extracts, and the critical foot notes. In all these Mr. Plummer displays accurate scholarship and sound judgment, while the Clarendon Press *imprimatur* means the usual perfection of mechanical execution. The introduction touches briefly and well the MS. sources of the text and the general historic outline of the period.

We have, however, a few corrections to note in the glossary: insert '*ābisgod* see *ābysgian*'; *āccnedness*, *ānness*, *baernett*, *bliss*, *gelicness*, *gescyldness*, *geþwaetrness*, *gewinn*, *gewiss*, *gewitness*, *sibsumness*, *þwaernness*, omit final letter in accordance with 'Cook-Sievers', p. 127-128; insert *Aduent* (863), *aeteowian* ['v. *aetywian*'] *ana*. 'alone, 972, 978,' *daelf* 'dike 963,' *dun* 'sf. hill,' *Iglea* referred to under *Aeglea* yet omitted, *laefan* 'wv. leave,' *ungeþwaernes*, see *unþwaernes*; *aloð*, strike out 's. ealo' and read 's. indecl. *ale* 852 E'; *bēntigðe*, after 'prayer,' add 'successful'; *daēdbót* is rather 'repentance, penance'; *ēa*. definition, 'river, stream' omitted; omit *ealo* which is not nom. of *aloð* as per Cook-Sievers' 282, N. 2; *gemana* should precede *ge-mannian* just as *Stānford*, *stānweall*; *þurfan*, *þurh* and; *wisdōm*, *wise*.

Either of these works would form admirable material for early instruction or parallel reading; but, in all fairness, we must give the palm to the book of Mr. Plummer for scientific accuracy, critical acumen and intelligent perception of the beginner's needs. The price too is in its favor; it costing but three shillings to the other's five.

R. B. WOODWORTH.

Duffields, W. Va.

GOTHIC PRIMER.

A Primer of the Gothic Language, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary, by JOSEPH WRIGHT, Ph.D., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1892. 12mo, pp. 247.

Dr. Wright's 'Gothic Primer' is the third in a series of Germanic primers by the same author (Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iii, pp. 203-204, and vol. v, pp. 53-54). It is by far the most

scholarly and most complete of them, going really beyond the scope of a mere primer; the phonology alone fills sixty-five pages.

That the treatment of the subject is based on scientific principles and embodies the latest results—as far as they are touched upon—was to be expected of the translator of Brugmann's 'Comparative Grammar.' The first part contains the Phonology of the Gothic language (pp. 2-66); is very carefully done, clear and precise, and well-suited to lead the beginner safely through the labyrinth of Primitive Germanic phonetics. A few additions would have made this section complete even for the advanced student, who will especially miss in this book a historical treatment of the *ablaut*. Grassmann's law ought to have been stated; so much the more so as some illustrations in Greek and Sanskrit are given that cannot be understood by the beginner without a knowledge of the cause of these exceptions. (Cf. p. 48.)—P. 15. Why not print sonant nasals and liquids *ŋ*, *ŋ*, *ŋ*, *ŋ*, instead of *l*, etc.?—P. 19, *ŋ* (Lat. *or*, Gr. *αρ*, *ρα*) is said to have become *ur*; *ŋ* (Lat. *ol*, Gr. *αλ*, *λα*) > *ul*, *lu*. For *lu* no example is given. Beside *ur*, *ru* ought to have been mentioned; cf. Skr. loc. plur. *bhrātṛ-śu*, Gothic *brōþru-m*.—P. 64, § 139, section 3 should read: "ð became *p* after vowels, both finally and before -s."

The accident (pp. 66-126) is a simplified presentation of the corresponding part in Braune's 'Gotische Grammatik.'—P. 93, *fidurragineis*, 'tetrarchate,' which occurs only in Luke iii, 1, as dat. sg. *fidurraginja* had better be given as neuter, *fidurragini*. Misprints occur on p. 103, *haitáu*, instead of *hāitáu*; and p. 104, note i: *nēm-eiwa* for *nēm-eiwa*.

Chapter xv (pp. 127-139) contains an outline of the syntax, tolerably complete for a primer; it is mostly drawn from Douse's 'Introduction to the Gothic of Ulfilas.'

After a concise account of the life of Ulfilas, the extant MSS., and a bibliography of the most indispensable works on Gothic, follow fifty-four pages of text, taken from the eighth edition of Heine's 'Ulfilas'; the diphthongs and quantities are marked throughout. In the Notes care has been taken to elucidate difficult constructions by references to the Greek text. A short chapter on Gothic spell-

ing and the pronunciation of Greek proper names and loan-words completes the volume.*

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

Le Rime di Tullia D'Aragona Cortigiana del Secolo xvi. edita a cura e studio di Enrico Celani. Bologna: Romagnoli Dall'Acqua, 1891. 8vo, pp. lxiii and 199. (*Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie.*)

FROM the view-point of morals, the picture which the life of Tullia d'Aragona presents to us, as depicted by Celani in this volume, is by no means an edifying one. If the beginning of the sixteenth century in Italy was, on the one hand, a period of great culture and mental activity, it was, on the other, stained by the deepest vices. It was in lyrical poetry above all things, the age of the *Petrarchisti*,—Petrarch was the idol before whom the *rimatori* of the sixteenth century prostrated themselves, and beside the ideal, platonic love of the *cantor di Laura* these poets sang "at the same time and in the same manner the love for the *cortigiana*." The warped moral character of this period of the Italian *rinascimento* is thus strikingly characterized by Gaspari:¹

"L'Amore platonico per dame altolocate, il quale vive più nella fantasia che nel cuore, quando non è del tutto una finzione di moda, e l'amore per la cortigiana cantano codesti poeti nello stesso tempo ed alla stessa guisa. Bernardo Tasso celebra Ginevra Malatesta e Tullia d'Aragona; il Molza, Camilla Gonzaga e la spagnuola Beatrice. Questa mescolanza dell'affetto sensuale e dello spirituale, questa mancanza di scrupoli per macchie morali, sono caratteristiche del tempo, e la dama virtuosa stessa non se ne scandalizza punto. In un sonetto (*Molza, che al ciel*) Vittoria Colonna parla al Molza della sua Beatrice; nondimeno è pur da osservare, che ella loda non già la persona cantata, etc."

*The reviewer has had a Gothic grammar in preparation for some time, but frequent interruptions have delayed its appearance. As far as the MS. is ready, it follows the plan of Wright's 'Primer' so closely that its publication in this form seems superfluous. He would gratefully receive the opinions of his colleagues as to the merits of the 'Gothic Primer' as a working text-book in our universities, and any suggestions as to changes and additions which would serve to make the book more complete and perhaps better suited to the wants of American students.

¹ 'Storia della Letteratura Italiana' di Adolfo Gaspari, trad. da Vittorio Rossi. Torino: Loescher, 1891. Vol. ii, part ii, p. 132. The best account of Tullia d'Aragona will be found in the same volume, pp. 136-160.

That in such an age, a courtesan should receive the homage of poets and men of genius, need cause no wonder, for the story is an old one. Celani has well said: "These (men of letters) were then as now, and as perhaps unfortunately they will always be, richer in genius, in madrigals and in epistles than in money." Antonio Brocardo wrote in praise of the *cortigiane*, Varchi exalted the *Aragona*, Michael Angelo Buonarroti, *Faustina Mancina*; and Niccolò Martelli, *madonna Salterella*. But to us it must seem a strange spectacle that the Marchesa di Pescara, whom the world has always considered a very paragon of womanly virtue and nobility of soul, should consider it not unworthy of herself to notice such a person in her poetry; and doubtless Donna Eleonora di Toledo, Duchess of Florence, considered with feelings not unmixed with pride, the dedication of the poems of such a celebrity as Tullia d'Aragona. It is a curious chapter in the history of human frailty—this clinging to one another's skirts in the hope of a transient immortality.

"The barrier which had precluded all women from culture in the Middle ages being once broken, the *rinascimento* led to two opposite extremes;—to a positive and serious culture, on the one hand to license, the result of a misunderstood liberty, which lead, in its turn, as an inevitable antithesis, to the education of the cloister."

The appearance of the *cortigiana* at the beginning of the sixteenth century is discussed at some length by Celani, who thereby justifies the century of its darker moral predecessors. "Lo sviluppo della *cortigiana* . . . viene certamente a smentire l'asserzione che il cinquecento fosse l'età più feconda di turpi vizii, etc." The *cortigiane* were not long in availing themselves of the culture with which they were surrounded; they vied with the *donne oneste* in learning and refinement, and thus at the beginning of the century, we find beside such names as Vittoria Colonna and Veronica Gambara, two *cortigiane*, Tullia d'Aragona and Veronica Franco.

Tullia d'Aragona was born at Rome, the daughter of a *cortigiane* Giulia Campana of Ferrara and Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona. The year of her birth is unknown, but according to Celani, was probably about 1510. Of her

youth, little has come down to us; she lived probably in Florence in 1517 and 1518, afterwards in Siena and then "vedendo la madre che costei haveva di virtù principio grande considerò che Roma è terra da donne, e massime che ella sapea l'usanza della corte e così l'ha fatta cortigiana." We are told that at an early age she wrote Latin and Italian, that she had the most exquisite manners, and that she played and sang so that "i primi professori degli esercizi ne restavano meravigliati." She spoke with rare grace and eloquence, and "like another Cleopatra she knew how to captivate the souls of her listeners."

In personal appearance Tullia is described as tall, not beautiful, but agreeable (*piacevole*), with eyes "bellissimi e splendidissimi, e nei movimenti loro una certa forza vivace che pareva gittassero fuoco negli altrui cuori"; hair of a golden blonde "often praised by her admirers, among whom was Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici, whom the purple did not prevent from burning his grain of incense before *la bella Aragonese*." Her portrait, painted by Alessandro Bonvicino, called *il Moretto*, is preserved in the *pinacoteca Tosio* in Brescia.

This glowing description of the poetess in no way agrees with that given by Giral di in the vii novel of his 'Ecatommiti,' "but the odium which Giral di shows in speaking of Tullia, makes us," as Celani says, "if not believe, at least suspect, that *invano abbia picchiato alla porta della bella cortigiana*." Indeed the loose-tongued and malevolent Giral di even denies her *any* personal beauty,—says she had a large mouth, thin lips and a long nose "gibbuto et nella estrema parte grosso et atto a porre sommo difetto in ogni bella faccia s'egli tra le guancie vi fosse posto."

It were useless here to trace Tullia in all her peregrinations. She was in Rome in 1531 and in Venice in 1535, where her sister Penelope was born, and where she was courted by Bernardo Tasso and Speroni. This sister, who died in 1549, also bore the name of *Aragona*, at which Celani remarks "quasi la Giulia ferrarese per essere un tempo stata l'amante di un cardinale di casa Aragona avesse il diritto di chiamare Aragonesi anche i figliuoli nati parecchi lustri dopo che il buon cardinale aveva reso l'anima a Dio."

The report of Tullia's noble origin, as Gaspari says, was not without its effect "si che molti sarrebbero corsi dietro a Tullia *per nobilitarsi*." In 1537 we find her in Ferrara, where she had arrived a few days after Vittoria Colonna. One of her admirers, in a letter to Isabella d'Este speaking of this *gentil cortigiana di Roma* says: "Questa è molto gentile, discreta, accorta et di ottimi et divini costumi dotata: . . . non c'è donna in questa terra che la paregi, anchora che la Ill. ma S. ra Marchesa di Pescara sia, ecc., ma, etc." She was now at the very height of her success, surrounded by poets and *gentiluomini* who flattered and courted her "and put the lie upon her not very honorable past by recognizing in her only the poetess, the descendant of the *sangue real*." Muzio and Bentivoglio showered praises upon her in prose and verse and Tullia was exalted above Vittoria Colonna. *Ancora una volta la cortigiana trionfava*.

In 1543 Tullia was married at Siena to Silvestro Guicciardi of Ferrara, a husband who seems to have caused her no inconvenience, for he never again appears upon the scene. The Siennese documents show that she was "legally at least," the daughter of Costanzo Palmieri d'Aragona, for she is called Tullia Palmeria de Aragonia. Here in 1544 she was accused of residing in a quarter of the city, and of wearing clothing and ornaments forbidden to the *meretrici* by the statutes of the commune. Of this she was acquitted, the judgment being "D. Tulliam de Aragona Sen. habitantem, non esse comprehensam in statuto meretricium, dantes licentiam omnibus et quibuscumque personis locandi domos dicte domine Tullie, et absque aliqua pena, etc." (p. xxxiii). In August of the same year she was accused of wearing the *sbernia* at Easter;—of this she was likewise acquitted, "fuit declaratum sibi licere portare sberniam instantibus omnibus, etc." Toward the close of 1545, Tullia is again in Florence, and fortune again seemed to favor her. Here she gained the friendship of Varchi, Martelli and others, who mention her in their poems and letters, but here once more in 1547 her evil fate overtook her. In April she was summoned before a magistrate, under a law promulgated by Duke Cosimo in October 1546, which obliged

cortigiane to wear a yellow veil, or something of a yellow color, to distinguish them from *oneste gentildonne*. Doubtless Tullia thought, on account of her fame as a poetess, that she was no longer included in the class to which this law referred. She had recourse to Don Pedro de Toledo, nephew of the Duchess Eleonora, who advised her to send a petition to the Duchess, accompanied by a copy of the sonnets written to her "da illustri letterati." The petition had the desired effect, Duke Cosimo *di suo pugno* endorsing upon it "Fas-seli gratia per poetessa."² In 1548 Tullia is in Rome and here she fell again into her former course of life, "perhaps obliged by necessity, perhaps induced by her evil genius, her mother Giulia."³ In the book of 'Taxes upon courtesans for bridge-repairs,' it appears that she paid for her apartments a rent of forty scudi, and was taxed, in proportion four scudi "and she was one of the *cortigiane* who paid the most." Tullia lived in Rome until her death, which took place on the twelfth or thirteenth of March, 1556, in the house of an inn-keeper, Matteo Moretti, in the Trastevere quarter, and here on the second of March she made her last will, which Celani gives entire,—taken from the state Archives at Rome. After a few minor bequests, chiefly of articles of clothing, she leaves the residue of her property to a boy Celio, under the guardianship of one Messer Pietro Cioccha, with the condition that the effects be sold, and the money placed at interest for the benefit of the said Celio, to serve "per imparare littere et altre virtù," and to receive the principal at the age of twenty-five. Of this Celio, who in another writing is called not only her heir but also her son, nothing is known, an examination of the archives of Rome not having revealed anything concerning his fate.

Such is the pathetic close of a career once so brilliant. "None of the poets who had courted her, sang her death, as was then the custom. Her last years had extinguished the glory that once surrounded her."

² It was in this year, 1547, that Tullia dedicated her "Rime" to the Duchess of Florence, and that they were first printed at Venice.

³ Gaspari, *Op. cit.*, 160. Celani gives the date of her arrival in Rome, as before February 1, 1537—as her sister Penelope died there on that date, followed shortly afterward by her mother (pxxxvi).

In addition to the "Rime" which Celani here publishes, Tullia wrote a "Dialogo dell' infinità di amore," which has been described as

"one of the most vivacious dialogues that we possess, in the lower rank of the *scritti letterari* of the sixteenth century, . . . on account of a certain freedom and grace, and also, at times, a certain Florentine flavor which she perchance acquired through her intimacy with Florentines, and especially with Varchi;"

and a poem in *ottava rima* called "Il Meschino e il Guerino," which Tullia says she took from an old Spanish romance, and which has been much praised by Crescimbeni. And though in the preface Tullia inveighs against the wickedness of some of the *novelle* in the Decamerone, the extracts given by Celani show that her poem now and then betrays the slipperiness of the time in which it was written.

The "Rime" of Tullia d'Aragona are certainly not without poetic merit, but, perhaps, they would not be republished to-day had they been written by some less-known member of that numerous band of *Petrarchisti* of the sixteenth century; a morbid interest will, however, always be attached to them because of the strange life of their author. Dedicated to the Duchess of Florence, they are nearly all eulogistic of the Ducal family or of Tullia's poet-friends. Altogether, the volume before us contains fifty-five poems by Tullia, all sonnets except two: the rest of the book is made up of poems, chiefly sonnets written to her by others, thirty being by Girolamo Muzio,—also an eclogue "Le Amorse." No trace of the life that Tullia lead is visible in her "Rime," which are lofty and spiritual in the highest degree. She has been called a *Petrarchista* of the first-water, and in the age in which she lived, she could not well be otherwise. The Platonic and ideal love of her great master, we find once more glorified in the sonnets of Tullia. She has been much admired for her erudition and philosophic culture, and her sole desire seems to have been "to pass down to posterity together with the men of letters whom she sang, and to make every endeavor to cover up the courtesan beneath the poetess."

Of Tullia's poetic skill, these two sonnets to "Il giovane Manelli," for whom alone, ac-

cording to Celani, she had an affection which we may believe sincere, may serve as an example.

xlili.

Se ben pietosa madre unico figlio
perde talora, e nuovo, alto dolore
le preme il tristo e suspiroso core,
spera conforto almen, spera consiglio.
Se scaltro capitano in gran periglio,
mostrando alteramente il suo valore,
resta vinto e prigion, spera uscir fuore
quando che sia con baldanzoso ciglio.
S'in tempestoso mar giunto si duole
spaventato nocchier già presso a morte
ha speme ancor di rivedersi in porto.
Ma io, s'avvien che perda il mio bel sole,
o per mia colpa, o per malvagia sorte,
non spero aver, nè voglio, alcun conforto.

xlv.

Ov'è (misera me) quell'aureo crine
di cui fe' rete per pigliarmi Amore
ov'è (lassa) il bel viso, onde l'ardore
nasce, che mena la mia vita al fine?
Ove son quelle luci alte e divine
in cui dolce si vive e insieme more?
ov'è la bianca man, che lo mio core
stringendo punse con acute spine?
Ove suonan l'angeliche parole,
ch'in un momento mi dan morte e vita?
u'i cari sguardi, u' le maniere belle?
Ove luce ora il vivo almo mio sole,
con cui dolce destin mi venne in sorte
quanto mai piovve da benigne stelle?

Sig. Celani, in a very interesting introductory essay, has gathered together all that is known, or that, perhaps, we care to know about this later Aspasia. He also promises to publish the *rime* of "the antithesis" of the fair Tullia, Veronica Franco, of whom he says:

"essa è l'incarnazione della donna libera del cinquecento ed è l'unica che canti liberamente i suoi amori: non s'informa a platonismo o castità irrisoria, ama per amare e soddisfare i sensi, e i suoi liberi amplessi, etc.,"

and doubtless the *bibliofili senza numero* are anxiously looking forward to the appearance of the *rime* of the frail Veronica; and there is a danger ahead, lest the two hundred and two copies in which the volumes in the *Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie* appear, may not go round.

H. A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

GOETHE.

Einführung in Goethes Meisterwerke. Selections from Goethe's Poetical and Prose Works, with copious Biographical, Critical, and Explanatory Notes, a Vocabulary of Difficult Words and an Introduction containing a Life of Goethe, by Dr. WILHELM BERNHARDT. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1891. 8vo, pp. xii, 275.

THIS book is Dr. Bernhardt's answer to the perplexing question how best to present to the student a symmetrical and fairly representative picture of the many-sided literary activity of not only the greatest, but also the most voluminous classical writer of Germany. In his search for a text-book suitable as a guide in a systematic literary study of Goethe's works, the author found the second volume of A. Lüben's 'Auswahl Charakteristischer Dichtungen und Prosastücke zur Einführung in die deutsche Litteratur' best adapted to his requirements. Actual use in the classroom of the sixty pages of this work devoted to Goethe, suggested additions, from time to time, of omitted poems, and extension of some of the briefer epic and dramatic selections, with accompanying biographical, literary and critical notes, until the almost doubled bulk of the resulting material suggested the publication of this 'Introduction to Goethe's Masterworks.'

The subject-matter, consisting of forty-two specimens of Goethe's epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry, and extracts from his Italian correspondence as well as from his biographical and historical prose, is wisely chosen. These specimens, either complete in themselves or, when fragmentary, ample enough to give an adequate idea of the works represented, supplemented by skillfully worded summaries of omitted passages taken chiefly from the commentaries of Lüben, Viehoff, Düntzer, Gude, Munckwitz, and Vilmar, are well adopted to the purpose of leading the student to an intelligent appreciation of the greatness and versatility of Goethe's genius.

The text of the selections is based upon that of Goedeke's critical Goethe Edition, modified in accordance with the new orthography.

The position at the end of the book of all mere word or phrase explanations prepares us

for the prevailingly literary character of the commentary. The latter, under such captions as, 'Inhalt,' 'Grundgedanke,' 'Form,' 'Quelle,' 'Litterarhistorisches,' reveals in the editor a keen literary perception, a fine sense of proportion, and the sure touch of a man whose expression is dictated by the successful experience of his own classroom. Marginal notes serve the double purpose of indicating, at a glance, the arrangement of subject-matter, and of furnishing convenient topics for oral or written discussion on the part of pupils, as a test of the thoroughness of their work. Illustrative quotations of similar poems by Goethe and others, expressive of the same or kindred moods, is an admirable feature of the editor's comments upon Nos. 6, 10 and 12. The literary notes are well calculated to stimulate, in the real student, a desire for a thorough and comprehensive study of German literature.

Chronological arrangement of the material, accurate indication of the chief sources, and immediate occasion of each work, careful analyses and summaries of omitted portions of the poems presented, brief but sufficient consideration of the metrical form of the lyric and epic numbers, Dr. Bernhardt's own suggestive criticisms, with his quotation of the characteristic utterances of English and American critics like Carlyle, Taylor, Boyesen, Lewes, and Emerson, and the 'Einleitung,' including a clear and succinct account of Goethe's 'Leben und Werke,' are among the many excellencies of the book that render it a worthy companion of the very best editorial work yet done in America in the field of modern languages.

Earnest teachers will cordially welcome this unique contribution to the means of effectively studying Goethe in our schools and colleges. May its success encourage the author to put us under further obligation to him by a similar presentation of other classical German writers! As it is primarily intended for the use of really advanced students of German, it seems to me desirable that a host of simple word-translations, easily supplied by any good dictionary, should be omitted in a second edition from the notes at the end of the volume.

The following slight errors have been noted: p. 15, 1, read, 'Kniee' for 'Kneen'; p. 16, 2,

omit 'the'; p. 30, 5, read 'sensuous' for 'sensual'; p. 35, 26, read, 'from time immemorial'; p. 43, 2, read 'was erected' for 'has been erected'; p. 46, 1, read 'no sooner said than done'; p. 60, 24, fails to show Goethe's error in deriving the name of the carriage from the (supposed) place of its manufacture, rather than from the appearance of Emperor Joseph I. in such a vehicle at the siege of Landau, 1702 (Düntzer); p. 73, 33, read 'by time' for 'by the time'; p. 94, 1, read 'tragedy' for 'dragedy'; 132, 3, read 'replaced' for 'substituted'; p. 151, 27, read 'eradicate' or 'extinguish' instead of 'abrogate'; p. 185, 11, read 'should' for 'would'; In the text, p. 140, 5, read *solltest* for *salltest*.

STARR W. CUTTING.

Earlham College.

MIDDLE ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Pearl: an English Poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited with a Modern Rendering by ISRAEL GOLLANCZ, M. A., of Christ's College, Cambridge. London: David Nutt, 1891. 8vo, pp. lii, 142.

MR. Gollancz agrees with previous critics in regarding the poems found in the Cotton MS. Nero. A. x.,—"Pearl," "Cleanness," "Patience," and "Gawain and the Green Knight"—as the works of one author. He proposes to determine an approximate date for "Gawain" (and so relatively for the other poems of the group) in a new way. The editor believes that the incident after Gawain's return, of Arthur's commanding all the knights to wear a green girdle, has reference to the establishment of the Order of the Garter. The only external evidence adduced in support of this opinion is that a later hand has written at the end of the MS. of the poem the motto of the Order; and that in a ballad (see 'Percy Ballads') founded on this poem, the incident is given as the origin of the Order of the Bath,—the writer being "aware of its original application, but wishing to make his ballad topical." Another bit of evidence to support this view which Mr. Gollancz does not advance, is that in the episodes in Chrétien's "Perceval" upon which Gawain is founded, there is no incident of this nature: it seems to

be used for the first time by the author of "Gawain."

The Order of the Garter was established about 1345, and as a "number of Gawain romances appeared in the sixties and seventies of the century," the date of composition of "Gawain and the Green Knight" is placed about 1360.

The editor thinks, with other critics, that the author passed from the composition of "Gawain" to that of "Pearl," or *vice versa*. Miss M. Carey Thomas, in her dissertation, "Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight" (Zurich, 1883), maintains that "Pearl" preceded the other poems of the group; because, considering "Cleanness" and "Patience" later, she finds a closer relation between "Gawain" and "Cleanness" than between "Pearl" and "Cleanness." This view is based principally on the similarity in the description of the feasts in "Gawain," ll. 114-120, and in "Cleanness," ll. 91-123 and 1397-1406; and on the moral teaching of the two poems being the same.

These points of resemblance do not seem to me to indicate so near a relation as that which exists between "Pearl" and "Cleanness." Direct reminiscences of "Pearl" are found in "Cleanness," ll. 554-6, 1068, 1116-1128, 1132; and in ll. 1467-1472 a number of precious stones are named in almost the same order as in the description of the city in "Pearl," ll. 998-1015; besides, many parallels in single lines occur. Stronger evidence to my mind than this even for the later production of "Pearl," is its maturity of thought. The spirit of the poem shows that it is the song of a man who has passed through great sorrow, having now reached the height of a noble Christian resignation. In "Gawain" he was apparently just entering upon his ordeal. Placing "Gawain" first in the order of composition, then since "Pearl" is more nearly allied to "Cleanness" than to "Gawain," a number of years intervene before it was written; "Cleanness" and "Patience" follow in quicker succession.

Miss Thomas's arguments for supposing that 'Piers the Plowman' exerted some influence on "Cleanness" deserve more serious consideration than Mr. Gollancz accords them. If

the author had read, as Miss Thomas conjectures, the second edition of 'Piers the Plowman' before writing "Cleanness," the date of the production of "Cleanness" would be about 1380. Mr. Gollancz believes (see *Academy*, Aug. 8, 1891) "Pearl" was composed under the influence of Chaucer's translation of the 'Romaunt of the Rose.' If so, its date is about 1375.

There is another poem which Trautmann (*Anglia* v., Anzeiger, p. 21 ff.) considers a work of the author of "Pearl:" this is the legend of St. Erkenwald, published in Horstmann's 'Altenglische Legenden' (Neue Folge), p. 265 ff. Mr. Gollancz misses in this poem the "peculiar strength of the author of 'Gawain;'" but, as pointed out by Trautmann, in vocabulary, diction, and versification it is similar to the poems of the group. A mannerism of the author of "Pearl" is seen in postponing the preposition (cf. ll. 17, 141, 206, and somewhat less characteristic cases in ll. 125, 288, 328, 330). The story is told in concise, direct terms, without useless amplification, and it is especially remarkable for its effective use of the specific in description (cf. ll. 55, 70-71, 140). These qualities, generally so rare in Middle-English yet so striking in "Gawain," lend probability to Trautmann's theory. No more immediate relationship can be detected, however; and if "St. Erkenwald" is by the author of "Pearl," the absence of subjective elements indicates that it belongs to the author's early period—possibly between "Gawain" and "Pearl."

The editor joins the rest of the world in rejecting the theory that Huchown, mentioned by Andrew of Wynton, was the author of "Pearl." Huchown is almost certainly the author of the "Pystel of Susan" and of "Morte Arthure," and while several of the peculiar words and parallel expressions which Trautmann cites (*Anglia* i., p. 131 f.) to connect "Susan" and "Morte Arthure," are also found in the poems of the group,—and many others might be given,—still such is the real difference in style, versification, and vocabulary that the two sets of poems cannot have been written by the same author. An intimate relation exists, however, between these poems.

A new and interesting, but, unfortunately,

slenderly supported theory of authorship is advanced by Mr. Gollancz: he conjectures that the "philosophical Strode," to whom, with Gower, Chaucer dedicates "Troilus and Cressida," may have written "Pearl." Ralf Strode is mentioned among the worthies of Merton College as a poet: "*Radulphus Strode, nobilis poeta fuit et versificavit librum elegiacum vocatum Phantasma Radulphi.*" Ralf Strode was fellow as late as 1361, which accords well with the supposed date of the poems. The editor finds significance in Chaucer's having, in roguery, dedicated a poem which he must have recognized as free in tone, to the author of so chaste a work as "Pearl." The weight of testimony for Strode's authorship is not exaggerated by Mr. Gollancz: the theory so far is only a possible solution of a knotty problem.

The editor has studied the MS. of "Pearl" carefully, and gives a more accurate text than that of the previous edition. This edition "aims at gaining readers outside the limited circle of specialists;" but the requirements of specialists have been kept in view in preparing the work. The "Modern Rendering" is very free: the editor "attempts to do justice to the spirit of the original," which amounts in some cases to taking, what seem to me, unwarranted liberties with the text (cf., for example, 3. 11-12; 52. 1-2).

The notes explain satisfactorily many difficult passages of the poem, although some of doubtful meaning are yet to be cleared up. *To clantly clos in golde so clere* (1. 2) is rendered: "so deftly set in gold so pure;" yet the note explains: "'too cleanly enclosed' (i. e. for earthly existence)," and adds that the augmentative use of *to* is anomalous. At 52. 3, however, *to* must again be rendered 'so.' Moreover, a comparison of "Morte Arthure," l. 1109 or 1133 will show that *cleanly* has at this period (and retains still) the special meaning 'entirely'—in this passage possibly 'neatly,' or, as the editor himself well renders it, 'deftly'—but not 'cleanly' = 'purely.'

Strothe, in the line (10. 7), *Quen strothe men slepe*, is not satisfactorily explained by O. N. *strād*, 'men sleeping beneath their thatches,' nor by O. N. *stroðinn* (cf. *Academy*, July 11, 1891, p. 36), 'when mortals sleep in one

another's embraces.' It is likewise difficult in this passage to connect *strothe* with A. S. *strūdan*, as Dr. Morris (*Academy*, June 27, 1891) suggests.

A happy emendation by Mr. Gollancz (*Academy*, July 11) is that of l. 12. 8: *By-twene myrthez by merez made*, to *By-twene merez by Myrthē made*, in which *Myrthē* is 'Sir Mirth' (*Déduis*) of the 'Romaunt of the Rose.' A reference to Prof. Zupitza's explanation of *bydene* ('Guy of Warwick,' l. 2408) would have been appropriate in a note (17. 4) on that word.

As possibly throwing light upon the difficult word, *werle* (18.5), I suggest a comparison with *herle*, "Gawain," l. 190: *Ay a herle of ðe here, an oðer of golde*, referring both to M.E. *hwirlen*.

Mr. Gollancz offers an ingenious and, to my mind, probable explanation—although Dr. Morris (*Academy*, June 27) finds it unconvincing—of the obscure word *westernays* (26.7), by connecting it with O. F. *bestorneis*, 'turned awry.' The explanation would be strengthened by citing a similar partial translation of a French word in "Cleanness," l. 1044: *apple-garnade*, which is, of course, 'pomegranate.'

Mr. Gollancz and the Bradley-Stratmann Dictionary (s. v. *endoren*) are surely wrong in assigning to *endorde* (31.8) the meaning 'adored': *my dere endorde* clearly means 'my dear bright-shining-one.' Prof. James A. Harrison has a note on *endorrede* in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, p. 50, where he explains it as "=*Fr.* en+dorés=gilded." Although *endorrede* ("Awntyrs of Arthure," l. 458) is in quite a different connection from that in which *endorde* is used in "Pearl," still it is probably the same word. Compare further *darielles endordide* ("Morte Arthure," l. 199), in which there is reduplication of the past participial ending, the meaning remaining, however, quite clear.

Spornande (31.3) does not, I think, mean 'rushing,' but 'stumbling,' 'going wrong,' 'recalcitrant;' see the examples in the Bradley-Stratmann Dictionary, and more especially the sense of this passage.

The following errata have been noticed: The numbering of stanza 39 is omitted. 79.3: *on e*: a misprint for *fonde*, which Morris has(?). 87.4: for *patez* read *platez*.

In the notes the following need correction: 5:5: for 85. 5, 9 read 89. 5, 9. 10. 7: for 11. 8 read 11. 5. 12. 10: for 488 read 48. 8(?). 13. 7: for Gawain 2488 read Gawain 488. 14. 7: "cp. note 14. 5"—there is none: 17. 11(?). 40. 7: for 70. 12 read 71-2. 12(?). For 47. 4 read 47. 5.

A review of "Pearl" would be incomplete without mentioning the Pre-Raphaelite allegorical frontispiece by Mr. Holman Hunt, and the exquisite prefatory quatrain by the poet laureate with which Mr. Gollancz has enriched his beautiful and valuable edition.

THOMAS P. HARRISON.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

POPULAR ETYMOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Is the following instance of 'popular etymology' familiar to the readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES? On the marshes here is gathered the plant samphire, used for greens. Locally, however, only very few know or use the proper name, but it is always referred to as "sand fire." I might perhaps also mention that the farmers rarely say "marsh," but almost always 'mash,' with a very flat *a*.

W. M. TWEEDIE.

Mt. Allison College, Sackville, N. B.

CORRECTION.

In the last (May) number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, col. 315, l. 7: for *strong* read *strange*. *ibid.*, l. 18, insert *not* before *be*.

BRIEF MENTION.

In October of last year the new Danish Minister of Culture, Goos, appointed a commission consisting of representatives of the different classes of schools, to consider the subject of orthography. The rules of spelling published in 1889, during the ministry of Scavenius, have not won general approval, special opposition to them having been expressed by editors and authors. The commission is instructed to examine these rules with a view to modifying or entirely changing the most objectionable features, if this seem desirable. At present there are almost as many systems of orthography as there are religious sects in America. The commission is especially warned to proceed as cautiously as possible and to make only such suggestions as give

promise of real improvement. There is every reason to suppose that the most radical of Scavenius' changes will be suppressed and many of the claims of the so-called 'Literary Orthography' recognized.

From W. R. Jenkins (New York. Boston: Schoenhof) we receive new publications in each of his series. The first is a short comedy 'Bouderie,' in one act, by Maurice Lecomte, who evidently is a resident of New York.—The second is no. 17 of *Contes choisis* and is taken up with one story, 'le Chant du cygne' by Georges Ohnet, rather melancholy in its tone.—The third is an addition to the *Romans choisis*, of which it makes no. 19. It is a product of the *Prix Montyon*, and, notwithstanding that fact, is a bright love-story. The title is 'Mon oncle et mon curé,' and the author Jean de la Brète, of whom we know nothing, but suspect the name represents a pseudonym. The novel is a decided improvement in interest and style over its predecessor in the series.

Ginn & Co. send us three reprints of French texts published under the supervision of Prof. Bôcher of Harvard. They are Moilère's 'Misanthrope,' reproduced from the edition of 1667, Racine's 'Andromaque,' from that of 1697, and Montaigne's 'De l'Institution des enfants,' from the original text of 1580. These literal reproductions are of much service to advanced students of the language and syntax, and we hope to see their number increased, particularly from among the authors of the sixteenth century and of the first four decades of the seventeenth. The series to which these texts belong has been named the *International Modern Language Series*.

Belonging to the same series are two annotated texts, 'la Famille de Germandre,' by George Sand, edited by Augusta C. Kimball, and Erckmann-Chatrian's 'Madame Thérèse,' with notice and notes by George W. Rollins. In the first named, the editor has followed the extreme of placing the burden of translation on the student. This plan is preferable to excessive annotation, but thirty notes for one hundred and six pages of text are far too few. They are not sufficient to justify editing.—'Madame Thérèse,' on the other hand, is judiciously and ably edited. There are but two notes in it which might be profitably changed, and they are of an historical bearing. The origin of the French flag is not as indicated on page 21, note 2 (see Chénel: 'Dictionnaire des Institutions'); and Provence (note 2, page 159) is but a small part, and perhaps not the most prolific, of the country of the Troubadours.

D. C. Heath & Co. have increased their French texts by the publication of Racine's 'Esther,' with introduction, notes and ap-

pendices by I. H. B. Spiers. The notes of this edition are thoroughly satisfactory but we have reservations to make regarding the page on the development of French tragedy, and the importance of Corneille in adapting its form to the requirements of acting. Of the appendices, the first on "French Verse" is hardly necessary after the remarks of Drs. Bowen and Matzke in the same series. The remaining four discuss grammatical points which embarrass every student, as that on the "Past Tenses in French," pp. xii-97. 25 cts.

An earlier addition to the *Modern Language Series* of this firm is Prof. Joynes' edition of 'French Fairy Tales.' Here the editor has brought together five stories of Perrault, which are best known in English, one of Mme. d'Aulnoy and two by Mme. Leprince de Beaumont. The purpose of the collection is to interest beginners, especially children, in the study of French, and for that end the notes are made very full, covering nearly one third as many pages as the text. They include remarks by the editor on the merits of the tales, grammatical notes and translations of the more difficult passages. Since the book is intended for the first steps in French the editor has made for it a vocabulary, which is to be commended for giving more than one meaning to a word and for showing the use of the various words in combination with others. By this method the advantages of a lexicon are gained. Prof. Joynes calls especial attention to the system, which he employs in the vocabulary, of indicating, by a dash, "not only, as usual, the title word, but also the stem or essential part, or even the whole, of the French word, when identical, or nearly so, with the English equivalent." By this means he hopes to encourage the habit of comparison between French and English words of like derivation. The labors of the editor conclude with a list of the irregular verbs which occur in the text, and a table of their irregular forms. We must acknowledge our obligations, as instructors, to Prof. Joynes for the pains he has taken to make this beginners' book so attractive and so complete in its explanatory features. There is no reason why elementary training should not be as thorough and scientific in itself, as the more advanced. To form good habits of study in his pupils is the aim of the earnest teacher, and systematic editing will aid him greatly in his efforts in this direction. The book is of convenient size: v, 147 pp.; price, 35 cts.

Longmans, Green & Co. (London and New York) have issued the story of Dantès' captivity in the Château d'If under the title of 'Episodes from le Comte de Monte-Cristo par Alexandre Dumas.' The editor, D. B. Kitchen, M.A., publishes portions of the original narrative, and connects them by occasional

summaries in English. He also gives a short biographical notice of Dumas and an introduction to the episode in question. The notes are poor in quality, performing too much the service of the lexicon and the duty of the instructor. An appendix on "Letter-change in the formation of French Words" is based on the English translation of Brachet's Grammar and Etymological Dictionary. The last twenty years of scientific study of the French language are apparently unknown to the editor.

Molière's 'le Misanthrope' is the latest addition to the "French Classics" of the *Clarendon Press Series*. Its editor, H. W. Gegg Markheim, M.A., has made a good study of the surroundings and spirit of the play in his introduction, but has curiously mixed up moral reflections and personal experience with the testimony of the seventeenth century society gossips. The text is preceded by the bookseller's announcement of De Visé's letter on 'le Misanthrope' and the letter itself is printed in full. The notes to the play are separated into two divisions. The first comprises nearly forty pages, and is devoted to historical and literary comments on the passages considered to be worthy of notice. The second division, of five pages, is headed "Translations," but, besides renderings in a rather florid and poetical style, this part contains a few grammatical explanations. The book bears all the evidence of being prepared for special students, whose main object in reading the play would be literature and social history. From this standpoint it is very well made. But instructors could not introduce it safely into the average class-room.

PERSONAL.

Dr. Waller Deering of Vanderbilt University (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. v, p. 31) has been called to the Womans College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, as Professor of Germanic Languages.

Dr. Alexander R. Hohlfeld of Vanderbilt University (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. v, p. 63) has been transferred from the Chair for Romance Languages to that of the Teutonic Languages.

Dr. R. Hochdörfer has been made Alumni Professor of Modern Languages in Wittenberg College (Ohio) in place of Dr. Hugo K. Schilling, called to Harvard University (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. vi, p. 192). Dr. Hochdörfer studied at the universities of Halle and Leipsic, passing the *Staats-Examen* at the latter university in 1881. He received the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Harvard University in 1888. From 1884-86 he was successively teacher of French and German, and Associate Principal of the Classical Academy

at Hallowell (Maine); 1886-90 Instructor in French at Harvard College, since which time he taught German in the Public High Schools and in the Sannett Institute, Boston. He is the editor of Freytag's 'Die Journalisten' (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, pp. 123-124) and the author of an article, "Recent German Publications," published in these columns, 1890.

Dr. Julius Goebel, sometime Associate Editor for the German department of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Literary Editor of the *Belletristisches Journal* of N.Y., has been appointed Associate Professor of German in the Leland Stanford Junior University, California.

Prof. L. Clédat (Faculté des Lettres de Lyon, France) has in preparation a phototype reproduction of the autograph manuscript of the 'Pensées' de Pascal, for which he would be pleased to receive names of subscribers either directly, or through MOD. LANG. NOTES.

Edw. Playfair Anderson was called to Miami University (Ohio) at the opening of the present Academic year as Professor of French and German. Professor Anderson is a graduate (1879) of the University of Michigan, where he received the doctor's degree in 1886, after a special course of two years study. From 1882-84 he was professor of Latin, French, and English Literature in McMinnville College (Oregon); 1886-87, professor of French and German in the Michigan Military Academy; 1888-89, professor of English Literature and History in Ohio University (Athens); 1889-90, professor of English Literature and Modern Languages in the Michigan Agricultural College.—Professor Anderson has written "What Vergil's Eclogues Owe to the Idyls of Theocritus" (Thesis, 1886); frequent articles (both signed and unsigned) for the monthly journal, the *Dial* (Chicago); the Introduction and notes to 'The Best Letters of Madame de Sévigné,' which he edited; and in connection with Professor Melville B. Anderson he was collaborator in the series of American translations entitled *Les Grands Écrivains Français*.

S. J. Brun has been appointed Instructor in French at Leland Stanford Junior University (California). Mr. Brun had his early training in the *Lyceé* of Nîmes; in 1876 he received the degree *Bachelier des Sciences* at the *Faculté des Sciences* of Montpellier; in 1881-82, was Instructor in French at Haverford College (Pennsylvania); in 1882-86, Instructor in French in the Cornell University (New York). In collaboration with Professor T. F. Crane of the latter University, he published 'Tableaux de la Révolution Française.'

Ernst Voss has been appointed Instructor in German at the University of Michigan. Mr.

Voss has studied at the Universities of Rostock and Marburg; he came to America in 1889; in 1890 he presented a paper entitled "German Secondary Schools" before the Schoolmasters' Club of Michigan, and has now in preparation a monograph on the School system of Switzerland.

OBITUARY.

BERNHARD TEN BRINK.

On May 1, 1890, Professor ten Brink entered upon his duties as Rector of Strasburg University for the ensuing year. The address which he delivered upon that occasion gave to his colleagues an opportunity to test the quality of his mind, and it attracted general attention and praise. On May 1, 1891, as outgoing Rector, he spoke fitting words of eulogy concerning those teachers in the University who had passed away during his term of office. On May Day of this year it fell to Rector Knapp to voice the universal regret for the loss of Professor ten Brink himself. *Sunt lacrimae rerum*.

Bernhard ten Brink was born at Amsterdam, Jan. 12, 1841. He studied Romance philology under Diez at Bonn, and received his doctor's degree in that department. His teacher in English philology was Delius, and this line of study soon became his chief interest. After serving at Münster as a privat-docent, and at Marburg as assistant professor of English, he came in 1873 to the newly revived University of Strasburg. He died at Strasburg, Jan. 29, 1892. Professor Henry Morley gives as the full name of Professor ten Brink, Bernhard Egidius Conrad ten Brink, and says that he died "from poison by the use of an unsafe cooking vessel." His death occurred "only four days before the date named for his daughter's marriage." ('Eng. Writers,' viii, p. 415).

Professor ten Brink published the following works: 'Chaucer Studien' (1870), 'Geschichte der englischen Litteratur' (1. Band, 1877; 2. Band, 1. Hälfte, 1889), 'Chaucers Sprache und Verskunst' (1884), 'Beowulf-Untersuchungen' (1888), 'Ueber die Aufgabe der Litteraturgeschichte' (Rectoratsrede, Strasburg, 1891). Among his contributions to philological publications, I mention only "Ueber den Sommer-nachtstraum" in Bd. xiii of the *Jahrbuch der d. Sh. Gesellschaft*. The first volume of the 'Geschichte' has been translated into English; it was published by Holt & Co., and in Bohn's Library. A translation of the half-volume of 1889, specimen pages of which I saw in manuscript in that year, is at last announced by Holt & Co. as "in preparation." An English scholar, W. Clarke Robinson, Ph. D., is the translator.—The sketch of Old English (A.-S.)

literature for Paul's 'Grundriss' was promised for March of this year, and may have been nearly completed.—Professor ten Brink's lecture notes were systematically arranged, and it may be that, through Dr. Levy of Strasburg, or some other personal friend, some things will now see the light which any less exacting writer would have put forth long ago.—His death takes away the last one of the founders of that valuable series of monographs, 'Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker.' About seventy volumes have appeared in the series since its establishment in 1874.

The eminence of Professor ten Brink in the entire domain of English philology, and his pre-eminence in those portions of the field which received his especial attention, are unquestioned. In the painstaking thoroughness and minute accuracy of his phonetic, linguistic, and grammatic investigations, he was not surpassed by any Dryasdust that ever toiled in those fields. Professor Kluge, in his history of the English language in Paul's 'Grundriss,' says of the Chaucer Grammar:

"Die erste und einzige mittel-englische Grammatik von wissenschaftlicher Bedeutung ist ten Brinks Chaucer-Grammatik die sonst ungekannte Verbindung von germ. und roman. Sprachwissenschaft [ist] hier ungewöhnlich glücklich und erfolgreich, und die Beherrschung sämtlicher engl. Sprachperioden so gleichmässig und breit, dass diese Leistung seit lange mit Recht im Vordergrund der mittel-englischen Studien steht."

Yet the prime interest of Professor ten Brink in the monuments which he studied was literary. If in accurate knowledge of the history of the English language he had few rivals, in acquaintance with the whole field of English literature down to the Restoration he perhaps had none. And everything that he wrote about literature is itself literature. He was never guilty of the fundamental absurdity of those who write about graceful books awkwardly, who contribute reams of harsh and dull writing in order to help their readers to an appreciation of that which is musical and sparkling. Every one of his lectures was, as far as possible, a work of art. Even the most dry and matter-of-fact passages in his books have all the grace of form that the subject admits of. The German language needs such a master in order to show its power.

Professor ten Brink was at his best in literary criticism. Here his broad scholarship, his ready sympathy and fine taste, his clear vision and firm grasp, and his skill as a writer, all came to full expression.

Personally, Professor ten Brink was most genial and kindly, yet always dignified. He had an old-school politeness that was charming. He desired very much to have his own work appreciated; but he had no petty jealousies, and his writings are free from

bitterness and personality. He said once that any man who would read his writings on Chaucer, could anticipate many of the Chaucer "discoveries" of another professor, but the words were spoken without bitterness. A mark of character is found in the fact that he postponed as long as possible his journey through the Cloaca Maxima of our literature, the drama of the Restoration,—and in the fact that the journey could not be omitted. Professor ten Brink was too exacting to attract many students. He demanded perfect work from them, and, of course, was never entirely satisfied. He belonged to a Catholic family and adhered to the faith of his fathers, but was a frank critic of the church. A full and interesting sketch of his personality and work from the pen of his pupil and friend, Dr. George Hempl, may be found in the April number of the Chicago *Dial*.

It is a fortunate thing that Professor ten Brink took for the subject of his Rector's address "The Task of the Historian of Literature." I will close this imperfect tribute to his memory with a few sentences from this address:

"Unsere Anschauungen sind in der Regel viel zu complicirt, als dass wir sie auszudrücken vermöchten; daher greifen wir eine uns besonders stark afficirende Seite, ein auffälliges Merkmal heraus und diesem geben wir Ausdruck in der Hoffnung, dass unser Hörer gleichfalls von dieser Seite her den Gegenstand am leichtesten zu ergreifen vermögen und so—zugleich durch die sinnliche Wirkung der Rede unterstützt—dahin gelangen werde, unsere Anschauung oder doch etwas ihr Aehnliches zu reproduciren."

"Selten aber oder nie kann der Künstler den geistigen Stoff [die Fabel] gerade so brauchen, wie er sich ihm darbietet; denn beinahe niemals entspricht er vollkommen der Idee, welche er darin erkennt oder in ihn hineinlegt. Da übt denn der Dichter sein Recht, die Fabel seinem Zwecke gemäss, d. h. in Uebereinstimmung mit seiner Idee umzugestalten Je tiefer, klarer, machtvoller, in sich vollendeter diese Persönlichkeit [des Dichters] ist, desto glücklicher wird die Gestaltung, die Umformung der Fabel vor sich gehen. Ein unerreichter Meister auf diesem Gebiet, weit mehr noch als auf dem der Composition, ist Shakspeare, dessen Grösse sich vor allem in der sicheren Intuition offenbart, womit er die tragischen Momente einer Fabel herausfühlt und herausentwickelt."

"Was Litteraturgeschichte für die litterarische Production bedeuten könne, zeigt uns vor allem die Entwicklung der neueren deutschen Dichtung in dem Verhältniss Herders zu Goethe."

A. H. TOLMAN.

Ripon College.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1892.

ANGLO-SAXON *Scár*-heard.

THE compound *scár*-heard and the phrase *scárum heard* seem to be stumbling-blocks to all editors, translators and lexicographers. The true meaning would be more easily determined, of course, if examples were of more frequent occurrence. *Scár*-heard (according to Grein) occurs but twice and *scárum heard* but once. The passages are as follows (Grein's text):

*Sceolde sweordes ecg
scearp and scár-heard of sceaðan folme
fýr-mælum fáh feorh ácsigan.*

Andreas, 1135.

*ymb þæs helmes hróf hæfod-beorge
wírum bewunden wala átan hêold
þæt him fêla láfe frêcne ne meahton
scár-heard sceððan.*

Beowulf, 1033.

*Genam þá wundenlocc,
Scyppendes mægð, scearpne mēce
scárum heardne, and of sclæðe ábræð.*

Judith, 79.

For *scár*-heard these interpretations and conjectures have been offered:

1. "Schauer-hart"—Grein: 'Dichtungen.'
2. "Ictu durus"—Grein: 'Sprachschatz.'
3. "Fight-hardened? [4.] (file-hardened?)"—Glossary to Harrison and Sharp's Beowulf.
5. "By file hardened"—Garnett's translation of Beowulf.
6. "Hard or [7.] hardened in the storm of battle or strife, [8.] hardened by blows—Baskervill and Harrison's Groschopp's Grein.
9. "Hart für die Feile, [10.] gehärtet, tüchtig gemacht durch die Feile? [11.] hart im Kampf-schauer, im Streite?"—Körner's 'Einleitung': Glossary.

For *scár* in the passage quoted from "Judith," these have been offered:

12. "Ictus?"—Grein: 'Sprachschatz.'
13. "Schauer [-hart]"—Grein: 'Dichtungen.'
14. "Sehr (durch Schauern?) gehärtet—Körner's 'Einleitung': transl. of Judith.

15. "Das Schauern oder Scheuern?"—Körner's 'Einleitung': Glossary.

16. "Scouring?"—Glossaries to Sweet's Reader and to Cook's Judith.

17. "Sharp from scouring"—Cook's Judith: Transl. Besides these, Körner has quite a long note ('Einleitung,' Theil II, s. 238), which he concludes with these words:

"Dass übrigens *scár* auch Kampf heissen kann, geht schon aus dem von Müllenhoff gesagten, ferner aus mhd. *beschâren*=mit Kampf befallen, und aus anderem hervor; diese Bedeutung wäre ebenfalls hier passend."

To the list of conjectures, I venture to offer another; first, however, stating two principles which will, probably, meet with general acceptance:

- I. Each element of a compound, or of a phrase, is entitled to due consideration in determining the force of the whole;
- II. The meaning determined must be in accordance with fact.

Of the interpretations collected above, unless *scár* be understood to refer to the "scouring" or abrading of the file, Nos. 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 violate Principle i; and with this understanding of *scár*, Principle ii is violated, for the action of the file cannot harden the object filed. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful whether *scár* and *scour* have anything in common.

Nos. 3 and 7 violate Principle ii, for a weapon is not "hardened" by the storm of battle.

To No. 17 the additional objection may be offered that *heard* can hardly=*sharp*.

Nos. 6 and 11 are identical, and, taking *heard*=*terrible*, *dreadful*, are the most reasonable yet found.

Nos. 2, 8 and 12 (=hardened by a shower of blows from the blacksmith's hammer) are possibilities.

Before accepting either of these, however, let us consider some facts:

1. It was a distinct habit of O. E. poets to speak of the sword in terms relating to its manufacture. It is unnecessary to cite examples to support this statement. *Scár*-heard (*scárum heard*) might easily, then, refer to the preparation of the sword for effective use.

2. Swords are now, and, perhaps, always have been hardened by being heated red-hot and dipped into cold water.

3. To suppose that *scâr-heard* meant *hardened in water* would be especially appropriate for the sword, since this weapon is almost entirely of steel. *Scâr-heard* is applied only to the sword, and not to any other weapon, offensive or defensive.

4. To suppose that *scâr*=(1) *shower of water*, then (2) *water at rest*, as the concrete result of the shower, might seem strained, especially as there can be adduced no examples of its use in the latter sense; but it would give us a very intelligible meaning for the passages, and does no more violence, perhaps, to the meaning of *scâr* than many, if not all, of the renderings quoted. Moreover, is such supposition too violent for O. E. poetry?

5. If such be the meaning, it may be asked why the poet did not form some compound more easily understood—such as *regn-heard*.* The answer is: (1) He could hardly have formed one that would express so vivid a poetic idea, and (2) the alliteration would be spoiled, for it will be observed that *scâr* forms part of the alliteration in each of the three passages quoted.

6. To all this it may be added that the "village blacksmith" always, even now, prefers to have pure rain-water in his "slack-tub."

7. If this explanation of *scâr-heard* be accepted, it will explain the equally troublesome *fȳr-heard* in *Beowulf*, 305:

fâh and fȳr-heard ferh wearde hêold.

It will be observed, too, that *fȳr* forms a part of the alliteration, and is, to that extent, necessary.

It is no part of the writer's wish to force this explanation upon unwilling scholars: it is rather suggested to them, and their good judgment will approve it or condemn, as it deserves. We may dismiss the subject with Körner's words:

"Mangel an lexicographischen Hilfsmitteln hindert mich auch hier . . . mir ein selbständiges, sicheres Urtheil zu bilden."

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

1. The explanation given by *Leo ('Angelsächsisches Glossar,' 640, 30), and Bosworth-Toller, both of which I have seen since the above was written, do not in any wise affect the point in question.

ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION.

THE "GUIDE TO PRONUNCIATION" AGAIN.

THE review in the April NOTES of my criticisms on the "Guide to Pronunciation" at least assures me that some notice is being taken of my article, and this means I hope some thoughtful consideration of the questions at issue. Were I sure this consideration would include a second reading of my criticism beside the review, I should be quite willing to let the matter rest. Certainly I do not care to make a rejoinder merely in the interests of discussion, and I shall try to say nothing which will be discussion for its own sake.

A large part of my article has been wholly untouched by the reviewer. He has merely misstated my position with the remark that it "needs only to be stated to be at once rejected." But I did not propose "going back to the early sources of the language, and tracing the sounds along the line of historical development." I did propose taking some advantage of the facts already known in the history of English sounds, in order to understand and account for their present relationships, and until this is done I believe there will be no sound basis for orthoëpy. Ask yourself the question, on what does orthoëpy now rest, and try to answer it. Can any one assert that it has at present any firmer basis than the indefinite "they say," and the traditions of preceding orthoëpists. The latter sometimes take precedence, since for the distinction between *fern* and *urn* Prof. Porter frankly admits that, "the majority of orthoëpists are in favor of observing it. It is at the same time true that, by the majority of English-speaking people, it is not actually observed." Now what does orthoëpy, or right pronunciation, mean in this connection? Is one sound so much better than another *per se*, that a distinction must be set up as a standard for the next twenty-five years, which is known to be disregarded by the majority of speakers at present? That two sets of words appear with *e*, *i*, or *u* in an orthography which became fossilized several centuries ago, is scarcely reason for such a distinction.

On the other hand, the sound of a vowel depends, as a rule, upon the sound out of which it has developed, together with its phonetic environment. This requires that we

recognize these two factors, and a clear recognition of them makes it possible to state the law in its simplest and completest form. It was this that I tried to enforce in my previous article by citing copious examples, and this Prof. Porter has tried to brush away by his misstatement of my position.

Some other points of my article are, however, taken up in detail, and these I wish to notice as briefly and as fairly as possible.

The reviewer first denies my statement in regard to the differences between the Bell system and the modifications by Sweet on the one hand, and his own modifications of Bell on the other. It was not a radical statement to begin with, but I gave examples to show the differences to which I called attention. Whether these are "general features" the reader may determine. It may be said, however, that the most admirable general feature of the Bell system, as of the modified Sweet system, are simplicity and ease of reference, from both of which there seem to me considerable deviations without improvement.

The reviewer also makes much of my charge that there is confusion between scientific and popular nomenclature. I am glad he did, for it seems to me his lengthy explanation fairly substantiates the charge. As Prof. Porter still clings to the old nomenclature in regard to long and short vowels, and has added both the newer phonetic names and a distinction of "naturally" long and short, it seems to me the charge is not unfounded. Again I say, I do not see any reason for the distinction "naturally long and naturally short." The reviewer says:

"Most phonetists will agree that, in the English language, certain of the vowels have a quality that fits them for long quantity, so that they can readily and easily be prolonged in actual utterance; while others, of an opposite quality, are in a similar manner fitted for short quantity, so that they can be prolonged only by a forced and, in some sense, unnatural effort."

Now what is the meaning of this? Does Prof. Porter assert that the sounds commonly represented by *ä*, *ē*, *ī*, for instance, can not be prolonged? The first is so prolonged, or lengthened with the same quality, by many persons in this country. The vowels *ē* and *ī*,

it is true, have remained short under certain conditions from very early times, but this is probably because we have no long vowels of exactly the same quality, with which these could range themselves when lengthened. In Middle English there was an open long *ē*, with which open short *e*, when lengthened, associated itself in many cases. Moreover, this long open *ē* is sometimes heard dialectally at the present time. There is certainly nothing "unnatural" about this, and for my part I do not see that the distinction is a wise or necessary one. As to deciding about the length of *a* in *ask* by comparison with a French *a*, as I understand Prof. Porter does, this seems to me to be making little of observation and much of theory.

In respect to the use of "regular long" and "regular short," there is no necessity for mixing them up with two other varieties of long and short, even if, for the popular mind, it is best to continue these long-used terms. This is what I objected to, and I must insist upon it even at the peril of being accused of "mental confusion." In connection with this subject, Prof. Porter has again illustrated my criticism on his choice of examples. He cites "*rēlate*' and *rēlative*," "*rēcord*' and *rēcord*" along with "*impēde* and *impēdiment*," as examples of the "regular long changed to the regular short." Now of course there is no case of change here, in the phonetic sense, since the vowels have been different from the time these words entered the language and assumed the accent they now have. But besides this, neither *relate*' nor *record*' have a long vowel in the first syllable, for the simple reason that all vowels in unaccented syllables are short in English.

Prof. Porter objects to what I said in regard to an open syllable. I think if the whole of what I wrote is taken together it will not be found so far wrong. But let me add this. The distinction of open and closed syllables is of little value, except as it has a direct bearing on the quality of vowel sounds. Now, both at the present time, and in the previous development of English, accented vowels followed by a single medial consonant, show the same development in most cases as those in strictly open syllables; that is they differ in their de-

velopment from vowels followed by a final consonant or by two consonants. Examples are numerous in the whole history of English sounds, as well as in present English. For instance, the vowel sound in such words as *care, ware, bare, hair, tear*, etc., is the same in each locality, though the vowel in the group of words may be different in different localities. But the vowel in *parent, parity, carry, Mary, wary*, etc., does not necessarily follow the sounds in the preceding words as proved by the great variety in these cases. The evident reason is that there is a difference in the relationships of these two sets of sounds, *care, ware*, etc., being strictly closed syllables, while the others are not examples of closed syllables in any such sense. For practical purposes they are open syllables, or may best be classed so, since the variety of sounds heard in the second set of words classes them with vowels in open syllables. I myself doubt if *parent* ever has the exact sound of *a* in *care*. As I hear it, it has no vanish and is usually shorter. The same is true of *gore, gory, tore, Tory*. At least the fact that Prof. Porter himself admits *parent* is exceptional,—a fact which I did not fail to recognize before writing my criticism—shows that he should not have admitted it to his list of examples. Examples should be typical, not exceptional cases.

As to short *o* in English I gave my own observation, somewhat extensive both east and west, and I cited two authorities whose independent investigation seemed to agree with mine. Prof. Porter tries to overthrow these by the general statement that "competent observers may be found in abundance to bear emphatic testimony against the opinion so rashly expressed." Will the reviewer cite a few "competent observers" and give some record of their observations? If the opinion I offered is untenable, I shall be quite willing to acknowledge the error when the proof is forthcoming. But the people cited as "competent" ought to be those who have made some consistent endeavor to find out the facts. I very much fear that most people in this country have worshipped "Webster" so long, that they are certain they speak exactly as he says they should, without observation of any kind.

As to the people I meet, I may say in answer to Prof. Porter's question, that they are from all parts of the country, but more largely from New England and the central and western states. So far as I have been able to know the facts there is no reason to suspect foreign influence, and, besides, I know of no foreign influence that would not produce just the opposite effect. Of my own familiar acquaintance, I know of but two who use English short *o*. One is a Canadian of Scotch descent, and one an American, who has lived in Canada and Germany for a considerable number of years.

Prof. Porter has wholly missed the point in regard to *Mahomet* and *Mohammed*. *Mahomet* was borrowed very early from the French, and its *o* at that time must have been unaccented. It, therefore, could not possibly have been English short *o* until it received the accent, which even at the present is not stable on the second syllable. The word *Mohammed* is, for etymological purposes, a totally different word, being borrowed very late, in this century perhaps, from some oriental speech. For these reasons the *o* and *a* of these words have not the remotest connection with the "bad" habit of Americans in pronouncing English short *o* as *a*.

In one respect, as Prof. Porter points out, I have misrepresented him, and I am glad to acknowledge it. The vowels in *fern* and *urn* are not separated in the 'International' as narrow and wide. What I was trying to enforce is, however, true; the words are put in different categories, and a different pronunciation is marked throughout the dictionary. As I have already pointed out, this is done in spite of the admission, that this distinction is not recognized by the majority of English-speaking people. In regard to citing the 'New English Dictionary' for support of the distinction, if Prof. Porter will read §4 of his "Guide" he will find it distinctly stated that the 'International' follows an American-English standard. This of course precludes any use of British-English as authority.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

NOTES ON SOME WORDS USED IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY,

NOT IN THE CENTURY DICTIONARY.

Entrain, entrainement—evidently from Fr. *entrainer*. The action of carrying over particles of syrup or sugar by the steam exhausted from vacuum-pans in boiling sugar. (*Louisiana Sugar Planter*).

First sugar, or simply *first* or *firsts*.—In the manufacture of centrifugal sugars (see Cent. Dict. 'subcentrifugal,' and 'sugar') that made from the virgin syrup and boiled to grain (q. v.) in the strike pan is called first sugar, first or firsts.—The molasses which runs out from the centrifugals in drying this, is boiled over and produces second sugars or seconds, the process being sometimes repeated to produce third or even fourth sugars.

Grain, to boil to—, to boil the syrup in the vacuum or strike pan until large crystals (grains) are forming, when the *masse cuite* (q. v.) or *melada* (see Cent. Dict.) is either emptied directly into the mixer and thence run through the centrifugals, or carried into the hot room to further the crystallization of the sugar.

Juice.—Not in Cent. Dict. in the technical acceptance of liquor extracted from the sugar cane before it reaches a certain degree of density by evaporation, and goes into the vacuum pan, where it becomes technically known as syrup.

Masse cuite, or sometimes *cuite* only—a synonym of *melada* (see Cent. Dict.) and much more frequently used in this country. The heavy crystallizing syrup as it comes from the strike pan, before it is drained of its molasses in the centrifugals.

Open Kettle.—open pan in which the syrup is reduced until it begins to crystallize. This was the process universally employed in making sugar before the introduction of the vacuum pan and centrifugal machine; it is still in general use among the smaller sugar planters.—Also a trade name for sugar manufactured by this process and synonym of *muscovado*, in contradistinction to centrifugal sugar, for which see Cent. Dictionary.

Seed cane.—the seed or plant cane (the latter alone is in Cent. Dict.) of the first year's growth.—Also the cane reserved for planting. (See *Stubble* below.)

String proof, to boil to—, to boil the syrup in the vacuum or strike pan until it becomes so viscous that it will be ropy or stringy, when tested between the fingers. The mass thus reduced is emptied into wagons and run into a hot room, where it is allowed to crystallize slowly; this process is generally followed for all sugars except first sugar (q. v.), and they are often called *wagon sugar*.

Syrup.—see above under *juice*. The molasses which runs out when drying the *masse cuite* (q. v.) in the centrifugals is never known technically by sugar boilers as syrup. The technical acceptance of the word used singly, is limited to the condensed juice (q. v.) from the time it enters the vacuum pan—(single, double and triple effect) until it is turned out as *masse cuite* (q. v.) in the centrifugal (see Cent. Dict.) process, or to the condensed juice of the cane just before it crystallizes in the open kettle process, (see Cent. Dict., 'syrup,') this is what is known as *syrup de batterie* among Louisiana sugar planters.

Stubble.—technically, in sugar planting, the sugar cane in the field after the first year. The first year the seed cane is laid in the furrow and from each joint a number of canes spring up, these when ripe are cut down to the ground for the first year's crop; from the *stubble* or stool the second, third, etc., year's crops grow in succession.

Windrow, (v. b.)—In speaking of sugar cane, the operation of cutting two adjacent rows of cane and laying them in the intervening furrow, to protect the plant from the effects of frost which inverts the sucrose in the cane, and diminishes or destroys its value for sugar making.

H. TALLICHET.

Austin, Texas.

O. E. ēa=GERMANIC ēā, AND OLD ENGLISH SHORTENING BEFORE

h+cons.

AN O.E. ēa for Gc. æ Sievers finds in *nēah* (§57, 2 d) and suggests that it may here appear instead of æ by analogy to forms like *nēan* *nēar*, in which ēa is due to contraction.*

*Davidson, *Publ. M.L.A.*, 1891, p. 128, explains the ēa of *nēah* as "breaking before h"; but breaking affects only short vowels.

Kluge implies another instance of Gc. *æ* = O.E. *ēa* in associating O.H.G. *smāhi* with O.E. *smēalič*,† but I do not know how he would explain the diphthong. It is, probably, this difficulty that has led some (Cosijn, Zupitza, etc.) to see in *smēalič* a Gc. *au*.

There is, however, really no difficulty, for *ēa* is just what we should, under the circumstances, expect in O.E. Gc. *æ* W.G. *ā* shortens in O.E. before *h*+cons. (S. § 125; Kluge, P's 'Gr.' i. p. 868) and this short vowel is later broken to *ea* (S. § 82) and, after the falling away of *h* before the sonorous consonant (S. § 222,2), is regularly lengthened to *ēa*. The same applies to *smēamēte*, *smēawyrhta*, etc., as well as to *nēalācan -ung*, *nēaliče*, *nēawist*, etc.; so that the *ēa* of *nēah* is doubtless due to these compounds as well as to *nēan nēar*.

It is evident that difficulty would accompany the attempt to mark real, not 'historic,' quantities in O.E.; but is it not absurd to continue to mark vowels long before *h*+cons., when we have, side by side with them, forms that could only arise as a result of shortening? I refer to the well-known case of *leoht*<*liht*<*liht* (S. §84 N¹), to *wēofod*<**weohbod*<**wihbod*<**wih-beod* (Kluge, *P. B. B.*, viii. 527), to *betwēonum*<**betweohnum*<**betwihnum*<**betwihnum* (Goth. *tweihnai*), as well as to *smēalič*, *nēawist*, etc., above. That this shortening is very old may be inferred from the fact that it preceded breaking, and (unless the forms *fa*, *fælcacan*, *gema(h)lic*, etc., are due to the influence of their primitives, which is very possible) the shortening does not appear to have affected *ā*<the diphthong *ai*, at least not when it did other vowels, that is, before the time of breaking.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF BAYOU.

So far as I am able to ascertain, Webster's is the first dictionary to derive *bayou* from *boyau*, and this derivation has been seen so long in print, and has been repeated in so many

†The definitions of *smēalič*, etc., in 'B.T.' are biased by the theory that these words are related to *smāgan* and *smūgan*, and that the development was 'crawl,' 'penetrate,' 'profound,' 'skillful' and 'exquisite.'

followers of Webster, that it seems to have become accepted as an incontrovertible truth. Now, Mahn is notoriously unreliable in his etymologies, and it is hardly probable that he has been more accurate in this instance. The word is evidently a French dialectic form, and if *boyau* was transformed into *bayou*, it is, to say the least, very probable that this change took place in Louisiana, where the word was first used in this country, and where it is almost exclusively used now. But the *bayous* of Louisiana are common enough to have left traces in public documents or private deeds, and if the form *boyau* has ever been used to express the notion of *bayou*, then Mahn's etymology has almost been proven a lucky guess, for to complete the proof the phonetic changes that led from *boyau* to *bayou* would also have to be traced in order to give his etymology a scientific value.

If the form *boyau* is not found in such documents, and if the phonetic changes cannot be followed step by step, then I would suggest two theories as to the possible origin of the word:

1. It may be a French dialectic form and have been introduced into Louisiana from some French province, though I have never found it in any glossary. But as I do not find a parallel to the changes of *boi* into *ba*, nor of *au* into *iou*—for the French pronunciation in Louisiana is not *bī-ōō* (Webster) but *bā-ū* with a slight stress on the last syllable—it is probable, if it is of French origin, that it was formed from *baie*: as *voie* gave *vo-iou voyou*, so *baie* would naturally give *ba-iou*, *bayou*.

2. But if it is not a French dialectic form, then the Spanish *ba(h)ta* offers the most plausible etymology. It may readily have been changed in the mouths of Louisiana Frenchmen into *bā-ū*, *bayou*, which naturalized into English with a shift of the accent to the first syllable became Webster's *bī-ōō*.

As to the parallel meaning of *gut* in English, I have searched in vain in French dictionaries for *boyau* meaning a stream of water of any kind, or a *gut* as exemplified in English in the Gut of Canso. French is my mother tongue and I have lived in several parts of France, Northern, Central and Southern, yet I have never seen nor heard the word used in such

an acceptance, nor have I ever seen it in thirty odd years of reading of French works of all kinds, including dictionaries, vocabularies and glossaries, the latter of which I have consulted with this definite object in view.

Moreover, there is no difficulty about the meaning, according to either of my theories: under *baie*, Littré says: "Petit golfe dont l'entrée est resserrée"; while Spanish *bahía* often means an arm of the sea.

H. TALLICHET.

Austin, Texas.

NOTE ON A PARIS MANUSCRIPT OF
GUERINO IL MESCHINO.

THE Italian prose romance of 'Guerino' (or 'Gherino') 'il Meschino,' sometimes further surnamed 'di Duracio' or 'Durazzo' (in French 'Guérin-Mesquin') has been looked upon at various times as a possible source of the 'Divina Commedia' (cf. Ginguené, 'Histoire Littéraire d'Italie,' i, p. 488 and ii, p. 24ff.). Gaspary, however, together with most Italian writers, attributes the work to a certain Andrea dei Magnabotti da Barberino in Val d'Elsa, who lived about the beginning of the fifteenth century, and is the reputed author of a series of romances. If Andrea is the author of the work, and not merely a translator from the French, as has been supposed, it is, of course, impossible that the 'Guerino' should have been known to Dante.

The same romance exists at the 'Bibliothèque Nationale' of Paris in MS. Ital. 491, described by Marsand, 'I Manoscritti Italiani della Regia Bibliotheca,' i, p. 108, under the title of 'Guerino il Meschino.' This MS. is marked on the back: "Hist. di Durasq."

Bibl. Nat. MS. Ital. 98 is also described by Marsand, i, p. 50, as a "Vita di San Patrizio"; this MS. is marked on the back: "legenda di S. Patrucio."

An examination of the script, kind and size of paper, etc., of these two pieces shows that they are parts of one and the same MS., the narrative of Il Meschino's visit to the Purgatory of St. Patrick in Ireland forming the sixth book of the romance. The last page of MS. Ital. 491 contains at the bottom the words: 'questo loco secundo la legenda,' which are

the opening words of MS. Ital. 98: 'questo loco secundo la legenda di santo patricio fo in quisto modo facto nel suo principio, . . . etc.'

It is this reworking of the legend of the Purgatory of St. Patrick which Ginguené (loc. cit.) erroneously supposes to be the source of the 'Espurgatoire de Saint Patrice' of Marie de France.

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Johns Hopkins University.

SOME DOCUMENTS IN THE LIFE OF
CHRISTOVAL SUAREZ DE
FIGUEROA.

ALL that we know of the life of Figueroa he tells us in his 'Passagero' (Madrid, 1617), a work of considerable interest, especially for its remarks upon the Spanish drama, and its criticisms of contemporary Spanish authors, of whom he does not always speak in the kindest terms.

Elsewhere,¹ I have attempted a sketch of his career based upon his 'Passagero,' and the following documents, if they add few facts to what is already known, at least seem to confirm the opinion of his character which I have there expressed. Figueroa was a member of that great army of office-seekers in Spain, which first came into prominence in the time of Charles V, and for which recruits have never been wanting up to the present day. He tells us in the most important of the papers here published, a letter written by his own hand in 1624, that he had served his king and country in different capacities for twenty-seven years. The offices he held, however, could not have been very lucrative, or perhaps he was, what was so rare in those days among Spaniards in public office, an honest man. At all events, he informs us in this 'tragic story' as he calls it, that he is without means, and complains bitterly of the ingratitude of his king. His letter, however, must have had the effect of re-instating him in office, for we find him holding the position of *Uditore della Rigma Udienza* in Catanzaro, Calabria, in 1627, where he fell into the hands of the Inquisition

¹ "The Spanish Pastoral Romances," *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association*, Vol. vii, No. 3.

and was thrown into prison. How long he remained in prison we do not know, but he must have emerged safe and sound, for in 1634

he held office in Trani, a town on the Adriatic, in the province of Bari.

I.

CHRISTOVAL SUAREZ DE FIGUEROA.

(MS. I, 68. Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, pp. 369-371b).

fol. 1b.

La tibieza de mi esperitu ha cobrado algun aliento para escribir este papel con la merced que entendi me haze V. S. a quien supp[lic]o perdone su forçosa prolixidad; pues tiene por costumbre no negar iguales fauores a los profesores de letras. Hallandome en Madrid sin necessidad, y en mi corta esfera quieto, se publico la acertada eleccion del S^r Duque de Alua para este Virreynado. La vecindad de casas, y sobre todo el deseo que siempre tuue servirle, perturbo en parte aquel sosiego, ya en mi como natural, para salir de la corte y seguirle. Comuniquelo con Bernardino Diaz, su secretario; y auiendo interuenido antes cierta ocasion, que el mismo me confesó, auia sido grata al Duque, con su bñeplacito vine a este Reyno. En el dentro de pocos dias me ocupó en plaça de Auditor de Leche y dentro tambien de pocos dio la misma a Geronimo Alzamoro. Esta improuisa quanto immatura prouision, juzgaron no pocos deuia nazer de otra para mi de mayor aumento; mas llegó presto el desengaño, reconociendose era priuacion. Participó assi mismo deste golpe S^{no} Antonio Ricciardo, tambien auditor alli, cuyo puesto, antes de cumplir en el, occupó Franco Capo Blanco. Estos fueron los rayos: mas aora es fuerça referir a V. S. con toda verdad, algo de mis acciones, para que segun ellas haga despues juiçio su integridad y rectitud. Aquel tribunal se hallaua entonces sin cabeza, por estar el Presidente auia seis meses en la cama. En la ciudad y provincia gran licencia de cometer atroces crimines vexada una y otra de varios delinquentes, jamas perseguidos, y en fin sumamente eclipsado el decoro de la justicia. Tratose, y lo solicite yo en partic[ula]r que todo cobrase mejor forma: y porque juzgué conueniente sumo rigor, donde la insolencia era suma, procuré derribar primero las basas que sostenian y amparauan los facinerosos. Embestilos animosamente y sin respeto a gradòs y riquezas los forcé a mudar vida, por lo menos aparente. Aquel pueblo por naturaleza es mas que otros pernicioso y libre; y sobre todos los nobles, cuyas casas eran inuiolables sagrados de homicidas y otros malhechores. Estos estrañaron tan insolita nouedad; porque llegada la ocasion de exceso, solo el bueno era reseruado de molestia y castigo. Hazia reconocer por instantes a los clerigos reboltosos y de mala opinion, y quitarles las armas, de que abundauan siempre, remitiendoselos despues a sus prelados. En seis meses, en dos cadenas se embiaron cien ombres a galera; se ahorcaron cinco, y condenaron a muerte otros; siendo assi que auia mas de quatro años que alli no se auia executado este genero de justicia. De todo fui dando parte al Duque, segun los casos se yuan ofreciendo, que por cartas despachadas por escritorio, mostro hallarse satisfecho dello; y ser conueniente se procediese en tal forma. Ni oluidé como experto en los frutos de los oficios, tuuiese S. E. por bien estar aduertido de los odios que ocasionauan estos rigores, para no dar facil credito a qualquier siniestra relacion que se hiciesse contra los introductores; mas esta preuencion fue de ningun provecho. Sabida pues la nueua del sucesor, escriui al Virrey fuesse seruido mirar por mi reputacion, mandando se me dicesse alguna noticia de las culpas, (si es que las suponian) para poder satisfacer con descargos; o que por comentarios (miserable partido y consuelo en tan grande calamidad) se me embiasse licencia para hazer dexacion del oficio; antes que el nueuo proueydo llegasse: y esto todo representé con razones de tanta fuerza, y palabras y sumisiones tan dignas de piedad y conuersion, que mouieran los bronce, y enternicieran las piedras. Alzamoro por los calores detuvo la partida un mes, y assi juzgando a proposito mi venida, por ver si con la presencia reuocaua, o detenia semejante deliberacion, tomé el camino de Napoles con euidente riesgo de la vida, respeto

fol. 2a.

de las mutaciones. ²En Bitonto encontré al sucesor con que perdi del todo la esperanza de lo imaginado; prosiguiendo mi viage con el desconsuelo que dexo considerar a V.S. Llegado a esta ciudad, hable a Bernardino, y hallele tan diferente de como le auia dexado, que no se me pudiera mostrar mas aduerso, si entre los dos se professara apretaditissima enemistad. Por ningun camino pude descubrir las armas de la ofensa: porque al preguntarselo, se encogia y callaua: solo con palabras nada ambiguas me significó, carecia el caso de remedio por la indignacion con que se hallaua el Duque y que solo podia ser de prouecho en desengañarme; que dispusiese de mi persona como mejor me estuuiesse cerrada segun lo referido esta puerta; cerré yo todas las que el discurso me abria para manifestar mi inocencia; porque de que me hauian de seruir, sino faltaua el oydo del superior, por cuyo medio podia pretender ser restituído y reintegrado? Desauciado por este camino, me rendi del todo a la desesperacion y solo traté de yrme a España en la primera embarcacion. En este inter, mi colega Juan Antonio, no como yo solo y desualido, ha por su parte rebuelto (como se suele dezir) toda piedra para ser desagrauiado. Hablaron sobre su justicia al Virrey varias veces diuersos auogados; y segun entendi, tambien en su fauor el Regte Fulvio de Constanzo; y el Proregte Diego Lopez. Y aunque en algunos meses nada se aprouechasen tan sollicitas diligencias; al cabo recorriendo de colateral (con ocasion de cierto proceso, que por despacho de escritorio se formó contra el en aquellas partes) declaró como diestrissimo en reconocer calumnias y falsedades, no auerse prouado nada contra el tal Ricciardo: y que assi deuia S. E. restituírle al mismo puesto, o a otro mejor. Este decreto salio haura dos meses, y en ellos el interesado habló muchas veces al Virrey, pidiendo su execucion que entreteniendole con blandos respuestas no ha tomado en el negocio resolucion hasta ora. Mientras aqui han passado estos incidentes, lo que acerca de la persecucion he podido rastrear fue; auer procedido del Presidente del Fiscal y Gobernador de la Ciudad en esta forma. Mejorado Anibal macedonio de aquella larga enfermedad, me refieren tuuo a sumo disgusto sin surpasse nadie el renombre de rigido en administrar justicia, y en infundir temor y obediencia en los subditos por tocarle solo a el este peso como a cabeza, o como a Maestre de Campo, siendo propio suyo el tener enfrenada aquella ciudad y la prouincia toda. Y pareciendole, no se podia disminuir la loa de la presente mutacion, sino con vituperio y discredito de quien la causaua, siendo sugeto obstinado, y no menos vano que sagaz, se unio con el Físcal y Gouernador comenzando a fulminar relaciones y malos officios al Duque contra nosotros. No se si V. S. tiene algun conocimiento del proceder del Fiscal. Fue desnudo y pobrissimo a aquella Aud^a nueue años haura, y oy se halla con treynta mil ducados. Professa ser dueño absoluto del Tribunal y mas dueño de la Prouincia.

Hombre soberuio y altiio, con aparente compostura de inaudita simulacion. Donde acometiendo puede vencer se declara publico, y quando no, encubre con falsa risa el veneno del coraçon, obrando quanto mal puede de secreto. Es natural de Napoles, con hermanos y parientes de grandes inteligencias, y no menores brazos. El Gouernador es un mozo inexperto, y aunque por naturaleza no asperso de condicion, dexas[t]e ganar facilmente, juzgando como codicioso solo conueniencia lo que resulta en su interés. A este casado con hija de cierto Valeriola agente en España del Duque, tomaron por instrumento para hazer que yo perdiessse la amistad de Bernardino. Porque auriendome dado un día una carta del mismo venida en su pliego, me preguntó si era el secretario mi amigo: a que respondi le era gran Seruidor y que no desconfiava miraria en las ocasiones con buenos ojos lo que le suplicasse. Con esto fundamento no mas, escriuen al Duque nos auiamos unido en el Tribunal Riccardo (sic) y yo, y que solo se hazia en el lo que los dos queriamos. Que de mi parte publicaua tener grande lugar en el palacio en virtud de Bernardino y que assi me seria facil conseguir por su medio lo mas dificultoso. Que con esta confianza procedia sin riendo y con escandalo: y era suma, auiendo sido el Fiscal el mouedor desta maquina, es de creer estam-

² Bitonto, a city and bishop's see, in the province of Bari, in southern Italy.

paria las razones y congruencias como se las dictaua al notable aborrecimiento que nos temia aplicandonos las peores colores que el supiese; solo por verse excluido del absoluto imperio que antes tenia; porque a la verdad se procuraua hiziesse cada uno no mas que su oficio. Esta carta ordenaron diesse al Duque cierto frayle, con la cortapisa de que importaua mucho passase V. E. los ojos por ella, sin que la viesse Bernardino: rezelando la podria ocultar si llegasse primero a sus manos. Leyda por el Virrey se la entregó al punto al mismo; que confuso y admirado se imagina respondio: No auia el dado jamas motiuo para nada de aquello, ni para que yo en aquellas partes vendiesse su nombre y fauores. Y dezia bien, porque en seis meses solo auia reciuido del la referida carta sin que esta tratase de mas negocios que cortesés complimientos. Desde entonces començo la borrasca desecha. Bernardino se abstuuu de recibir carta mia, y dar al Duque las que en razon de auisos le embiaua, temeroso de lo passado. Constole a S. E. la discordia entre el Preside y nosotros, y enfin, dando por ventura credito a lo de la union; si ya no a cosas de peor sonido, ordinó con toda presteza las sabidas prouisiones. Y es de creer las justificaria de suerte, como tan benigno y recto, que en la p^{te} que dexó de usar mayor seueridad, manifestó mayor clemencia; contentandose, puede ser, con quitarnos de alli por bien de paz, respeto de que llegando a mayor colmo los rancores, no sucediesen mayores escandalos. No admite o no haze posible su virtud la maldad agena; y por el consig^{te} dificulta, o no figura verisimiles los debates y pasiones que interuienen entre los de quien se componen estos tribunales, llenos todos, por la mayor parte, de malquerencias y embidias, por las competencias y ambiciones, quando no, por sus propios intereses. Y por este camino puede ser facilmente engañado, y mas de gente que desde que naze exercé industrias y estratagemas para cuyo conocim^{to} conuiene (como V. S. mejor sabe) tener muy despabilados los ojos; derribandose tal vez desde el trono de la bondad al centro de la malicia.

fol. 4a.

En esta forma, señor, nos assassinaron nuestros enemigos, valiendose de importunas y falsedades. Porque quanto a la misteriosa conformidad que alegaron teniamos los dos, es notorio engaño y mentira: ya que en quantas causas se trataron en el Tribunal, siempre concurrimos en los votos los tres Auditores, como se pudiera ver con facilidad. Y en la sospecha de sobornos (si es que tambien se valieron desta calumnia nuestros adversarios) aunque las intenciones no fueran tan limpias en tan breue tiempo como fue el de tres meses y medio (auiendo sido hasta seis, ferias lo demas) no se ofrecieron ocasiones en que dexar de serlo: pues como puede constar de los procesos criminales despachados, casi todos fueron con sentencias de muerte o galera: y de los ciuiles apenas huuo uno en estado de poderlo determinar definitiuamente. Mas de que sirve la proposicion deste abono general, si jamas se ha venido a la averiguacion de particulares, siendo las supuestas culpas solo de bulto? Lo cierto es, merezco yo por ser muy malo, mas estrecha tribulacion: y por lo menos quedo en no poco deudor a los autores, por auerme hecho experto en arte, en que confieso era ignorantissimo. Con justa causa quedaron vanagloriosos y contentissimos, ya que cosa mas bien guiada para conseguir su intento no la he visto jamas. Con tan fuertes lazos en la aprehension de su Ex^a que es lo menos auerme dexado indefenso, cerrandome yo propio los labios; pues hasta la imaginacion ha carecido, mostrandose esterilissima de razones. Muerte, estupro, herida, ni coecho seguro estoy de auerlo cometido: en obras menudencias no me Juzgo tan bueno; mas para las tales se introduxeron los sindicados al fin de las administraciones. Si primero huuiera auido carta de aduertencia o reprehension; o alcancaramos en que parte se hacia la punteria para herirnos, era forçoso acudir al reparo con disculpas o verdaderas satisfacciones; mas contra flecha tan veloz y al improuiso tan penetrante, que remedio sino el de Dios? Yo vine a este reyno confiado en la proteccion y aumento que mi persona podia esperar en el Duque, y así en faltandome su gracia, espiró todo. Recorrer al colateral seria especie de quexa y esta ha de estar en todo tiempo lexos de mi. Ni se con

fol. 5a.

que ocasion: porque quanto a ser restituído o mejorado, solo podra hazerlo quien sabe que estoy aqui expuesto y pronto a toda satisfacion, pero de que delito he de pedir gracia? Ni

de que culpa perdon? Solo podra distinguir y vencer esta confusion quien tiene aluedrio absoluto: y la mano que fue poderosa para desencasar esta piedra de golpe, es sola quien de golpe la puede boluer a su lugar, o aplicarla a mejor edificio. Aunque ya se terminaron para mi las pretensiones de por aca; pues aun quando por inopinado acaecimiento, se rompieron los denso^s nublados de enojos, y esta Alua excelentissima, por su grandeza, se mostrara en mi fauor con mas luz que el sol mismo, tras tanto servir a satisfacion, era poca cosa una Auda; mayor jaula ha menester el paxaro. Ni dexaré de apuntar, ser por extremo con ueniente passar los que escriuimos por iguales infortunios; pues con ellos dexan las plumas de ser boçales, boluiendose mas preuenidas y mañosas para tratar de todo, instruidas en astucias y engaños. Los jurisconsultos acaso pudieron imaginar o preuenir este modo de oprimir y descomponer? Y esta forma de petulante y arrebatado juicio? No por cierto, que no ay teorica de ten infame practica. La experiencia sola es quien la enseña: mas de victoria conseguida con tan afrentosa traycion indigna es la gloria. Y es justissimo que quien ligeramente dexó las comodidades y credito que tenia en la corte, buelua a ella con breuedad, mendigo y desacreditado; con trauajo en vez de aliuió, con castigo en vez de premio. Y sea, si alla buscado, aca huido: si alla juzgado benemerito y capaz; aca incapaz y demerito. Veynte y siete años ha que siruo al rey en diferentes cargos con certificaciones de Virreyes de mi buen proceder; con cartas de su Magestad en que lo confiesa y se da por bien seruido prometiendome en ellas aumentos y honras; solo aqui ve degenerado, perdiendo en un punto lo adquirido en tanto tiempo: suma desgracia. A. V. S. beso mil veces las manos por la merced que me haze en compadecerse della y crea que como en extremo agradecido, le sere verdadero y cierto seruidor en qualquiera parte que assista; celebrando (pues solo por este camino lo puedo retribuir) su acrisolado valor, sus muchas letras, su inaudita integridad y rectitud, columnas sobre que levanta monumento a la inmortalidad de su nombre. En lo demas, aunque me halle, quanto puede ser necessitado, sin amparo y socorro y en tierra donde todos lloran desdichas y miserias, le suplico no le ponga en algun cuidado mi remedio, pues sabe nos persuade la filosofia esfuerço y constancia en la aduersidad y es justo rezelar no sea esta censura de participantes, y por esto conueniente procurar huir de incurrir en ella. En tanto dignese conceder perdon al prolixo tenor de mi tragica historia, escrito a V. S. para que le sepa, y le sea notoria la raiz de mi pretensio agrauio y el origen de mi crecido sentimiento. No se con que semblante ponerme ya en su presencia, pues de corto he faltado (con nota grande) a mi obligacion, en no auerme entrado por sus puertas a ofrecerme criado mas confio excusara V. S. este natural encogimiento permitiendo la enmienda. Gu^e nuestro Senor felicissimos años su persona como desseo.

de Casa de Agosto 1624.

El Dr. Christoval Suarez de Figueroa.

Copia de la hortatoria fecha a Mons. Petromio obispo de Molfeta de que tanto se duele el Papa por este breue la qual le presento Juan Dominico de Jordano, actuario de la juridiccion real.

II.

(Ms. E. 17, fol. 295 a, Bib. Nacional, Madrid).

Reuerende uirregie deuote dilecte A nostra noticia e peruenuto ch' d'ordine uostro con famiglia armata d'arme di fuoco prohibite per le regie pramatice de questo presente regno con habito de clerici sia stato carcerato D. Christophoro Figueroa dentro la chiesa di S. Luiggi sita al incontro del Real palazzo doue noi habitamo nel corpo di guardia doue di continuo accudono li trattenuti soldati, et altri ministri militari in tempo che si celebrauano le sante messe, et diuini officj con molto scandalo del popolo et anco pericolo di quelli ch' andorno (sic) a far la detta cattura del che ne hauerebbe potuto risultare un gran tumulto in

disseruitio della diuina Maestra del Re nostro sigre, et di tutta questa citta, il che intendiamo habbiato fatto sotto colore d'essere ministro del santo officio, poi che si uoi lo fussino stato doueuati ricorrere a noi, e dimandare il regio l'xequatur, como si deue di ragione, e per antichissima consuetudine di questo regno, e lo fanno tutti li prelati del Regno alli quali come giudici ordinarij compete la giurisdittione nelle materie de sant officio, e come fa ancora il Nuntio di Sua Santita e si e falto in questo regno da quelli ch'hann hauuta commissione d'executar alcuni negotij della Sta inquisitione, ni esso accio che le cose che tocano alla religione cattca sianno executate con quel decoro, e sicurta ch'si deue nelli regni de sua Mta d achi e dalli suoi ministri uengono con particolare attentione fauorite et agiutate come si e uisto sempre in tutte le occasioni che son occorse per difesa della santa fede Cattca e della fede Apca Romana, e perche potrebbe succeder alcuno scandalo notabile si per voi si pasassi inanzi a dare simili ordini e conuien al seruitio di sua Mta sapere con che titulo et in che forma uoi uo' intrameteti in queste materie ci e parso farui la presente con la quale ne dicimo, et exhortamo che fra il termino di tre giorni debbiato exhibir auante di noi, l'ordini commissioni, o altra potesta in uirtu della quale uoi exercete giurisdittione in queste materie accio uiste si possa proueder da noi come conuiene in beneficio della Sta fede Cattca e della real iurisdittione che tiene sua Mta in questo Regno, e che fra tanto non debbiato essercitare iurisdittione nessuna, ne tenere congregatione o tribunale ne familia armata ne far altro essercitio; accio non si turbi la quiete di questa citta e non si faccia pregiuditio alla giurisdittione di sua Maesta perche non facendosi da voi se pigliarando quelli remedij soliti e consueti pigliarsi ni casi simili senza expeditione d'altra hortatoria e non farti lo contrario per quanto desiderati far cosa grata alla pta Maesta et a noi la presente resti al presentante. Dat. Napoli die 28 mens Januarij 1630.

III.

Copia de breue del Papa Urbano viii para el Sr Duque de Alcala, Virrey de Napoles, sobre el negocio del Auditor Doctor D. Xpoual Suarez de figueroa.

(Ms. E. 17, fol. 294 b, Bib. Nacional, Madrid).

Dilecte fili: Nobilis uir, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Ea pietatis fama Regium Magistratum in Neapolitano regno suscepit nobilitas tua, ut speraret Italia coeteros Austriacae potentiae ministros petere ist hinc posse propugnando Religionis exempla. Proinde nunquam timuimus fore, ut in urbe nobilissimi Regni Principe Regis uiribus per te laederetur ditio sacri huius tribunalis in quo cum fidei orthodoxae unitas custodiatur, muniuntur coelestes aggeres publicae tranquillitatis. Hinc conicere potes quo doloris vulnere transfixerit uiscera Pontificae charitatis, inopinatus ille nuntius qui nuper significauit Christophorum Figheroam, mandatu tuo ereptum uiolenter esse, e sacrae inquisitionis vinculis. Quod nam dilecte fili religiosae Ciuitatis oculis spectaculum praebuisse putas, regios satellites gladiis minitabundos, dum sancti huius officii ministros, non solum palam perterrefacere, sed armis etiam spoliare ausi sunt, ut reus e legitimo carcere eductus in eius custodia detineretur, cui nullum ius in causis ad religionem spectantibus. Porro autem qui sapientiae studiis ingenium excoluisti, scis quid tam graui in negotio, eccleasticae ac Pontificae sanctiones decernant. Quae enim ad religionis iura pertinent, ita nos tangunt, qui pro sacerdotis Maiestate vitam deuouere debemus, ut praetermittere non liceat quod ratio suadet, lex iubet et caelum exigit ne patiare.

Nobilis uir tam foedam nomini tuo notam inuri, atque aduersus te excitari non modo numinis ultionem, sed etiam Regis iram constituentis gloriam potentiae, in defensione fidei et sacerdotii. Quare pro paternae charitatis, et apostolicae sollicitudinis officio monere uoluimus, nobilitatem ut reum laesis sacrae inquisitionis ministris, ut suprema sacri huius tribunalis

ditio tam insigniter violata. Hoc a te solatium exigimus, atque etiam speramus, ut regiae pietatis imitatione eruditus, et nostris dictis excitatus gloriari possis plus Pontificia monita, quam pernitiōsa consilia ualuisse apud nobilitatem tuam, cui Nuntius Apostolicus mentem nostram declarabit et Nos paternam benedictionem impartimur. Datt. Romae apud Sanctam Mariam maiorem sub Annulo Piscatoris die ii fibruarii mdcxxx. anno Pontificatus Nostri septimo.

Joannes Ciampolus.

The answer of the Duke of Alcalá, as it recites no new facts, is not reproduced here.

IV.

CAUSAS DE INQUISICION.

(Ms. D. 154, Bib. Nacional, Madrid).

fol. 105. Contro

Christoforo figheroa Uditore allora della Regia Udienza in Catanzaro inquisito de auer estratto a uiua forza dalle Carceri di Nicotera francesco Ant^o Stantione Reo del S^{to} Ufizio.

Questo francesco Stantione fu carcerato diginbre 1627 perche essendo esattore del Monte della Pietà di Napoli eseguiua contro i beni de chierici, fu quattro uolte scomunicato et era indiziato di auer sparlato delle censure, dicendo que non le stimaua e che allora mangiaua con piu appetito, quando era scomunicato, che staua meglio scomunicato che prima, che non ostante le d^e scomuniche uoleua andare in chiesa e sentir messa, diceua che haueua dietro il vescouo e la sua mitra.

It recites that the said Stantione being imprisoned

'il figheroa andó con tamburo, e gente armata alle carceri con accette, archibugi e mazze ferra e perche ruppe quatro porte, e leuo di carcere detto Stantione,' etc.

fol. 105b.

Figueria refused to come to Rome to answer for his offence and 'questo si nascose,' but finally on January 25. 1628

'fu veduto il figheroa nella chiesa di S. Luigi uicino al Palazzo del Vicere, e la mattina carcerato in detta chiesa, et arrestato nel conuento pro carcere. La notte seguente fu con uiolenta dalla soldadesca estratto, disarmati li custodi, e condotto en Castil Nuouo, e poco dopo eseguita l'oratoria contro di l' Ministro (sic) del S^{to} Ufizio.'

He remained seventeen days in the prison of Castel Nuovo, and was then conducted to the *Carceri della Nunziatura*. On fol. 107a. Figueria in answer to the charges brought against him says: 'Jo in quel tempo ero uditore della Regia Udienza in Calabria.' His defense is very weak; he confesses the rescue

by force of arms, saying that the offense of which Stantione was accused was a very slight one and that 'non mi raccordo se il vescouo mi dicesse che era per causa di S^{to} Ufizio, potria essere che me l'hauesse detto, etc.'

Want of time made it impossible for me to read all the papers in the case. The following is extracted from the *Defese del detto Christoforo figheroa*:

'Nel p^o. 2^o. & 3^o Articoli intende di prouare ch'egli e nato di padre e madre nobili di Vagliadolid, allenato cattolicamente, che sente messa, che ha seruito in diuersi carichi lodeuolmente sua M^{ta} anche con sodisfazione di Prelati ecclesiastici' etc.

'Articoli 4^o & 5^o che per essere di Statione Spagnolo ha sempre tenuto in grand^{ma} riuerenza e timore il Tribunale del S^{to} Ufizio, essendosi in tutte le occasioni mostrato ubbidientissimo a seruire li ministri e tribunali suddetto, e che ha sempre abominato gli eretici e sospetti di eresia.'

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH ETYMOLOGIES.

Principles of English Etymology, by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, Litt.D. Second series. *The Foreign Element*. Clarendon Press, 1891. 8vo, pp. xxxi, 505.

It is very desirable that one or more good books should be available on the subjects treated in this volume. I say subjects because the field covered is so wide, and so much special knowledge is needed for a treatment like that here attempted, that one man may well feel himself incompetent to treat adequately all the phenomena. And if the writer, as in the present case, can lay little claim to the knowledge of a specialist in any of the subjects treated, then his highest aim must be to put in a clear and attractive form the accepted results reached by those scholars who stand in the foremost rank as investigators of the matters concerned. It is true that Professor Skeat is not altogether an outsider for some of the languages here treated, for he has, as the author of an 'English Etymological Dictionary,' almost inevitably been led to study somewhat the Anglo-French and the continental dialects of Old French, so that we may expect him to know and use some of the best books and articles published. His great industry and careful reading of modern philological works are again shown in this volume, and he has himself apologized in his preface for undertaking a task for which he does not claim to be fully qualified.

Perhaps the most obvious criticism that can be made upon this volume is that it attempts too much, and goes into details which it would have been better to omit in the interest of the reader, who would thus get a better and clearer idea of the most important principles, and also in the interest of the author who would thus have avoided some mistakes, or at least doubtful statements, he has made. Further, the material drawn from the work of other scholars has not been fully digested in the author's mind before his own statements were allowed to get into print. This appears from various inconsistencies and unfortunate arrangements of his matter, as well as an occasional infelicity of statement. In what is the most important part of the whole book, the treatment of the Old French element in Eng-

lish, it is greatly to be regretted that Skeat did not consistently take as his starting point the Old French pronunciation as it existed in France, and make this the basis of his treatment of the secondary Anglo-French and of the further history of the Old French words in English. This part of the work would thereby have gained greatly in clearness and might have been, at the same time, given in less space, while the gain in space might have been utilized for the presentation of some of the real or apparent exceptions, if it seemed worth while to mention them at all. The jumble of the *o*-sounds (*o* and *o*; cf. §§66, 70, 77, 87) would then have been avoided. Professor Skeat is well known to understand fully the distinction between sounds and letters, as appears, for example, from his chapters on English spelling and on phonetic spelling in the First Series, of his, 'Principles of English Etymology,' and in the present volume he has given considerable space to the pronunciation of Anglo-French. He probably exaggerated the difficulty of starting from the sounds and considering the letters only as more or less good signs for the sounds, for it would seem that the idea must have occurred to him. It is true we do not know exactly what the phonetic distinction was between *o* (*o*) and *o* (*o*) in France, nor what the exact value of Old French *u*=Latin *ū* was, but we do know that these three different sounds existed, and developed differently, and their development in England has been in general subject to laws which can be clearly stated.

The author gives nearly two hundred and fifty pages (Chapters ii—xii) to French and its influence on English, as compared with less than two hundred to all other languages (including Latin, to words from which a chapter of somewhat over forty pages is given), while several pages are devoted to subjects not properly belonging in this book, or not specially appropriate in it. The preponderance given to French is of course fully justified. Pages 294-316 are given to Italian; 317-341, to Spanish; 342-349, to Portuguese; 350-371, to Greek, and 399-440 to all other languages (Slavonic, Persian, Sanskrit, Hindustani, Semitic, Finno-Tataric, various Asiatic languages, Polynesian, African, American). Chapter xviii (pp. 372-398) treats of prefixes and suffixes. Some

foreign elements in English, it must be remembered, were treated in the 'First Series,' as the words early taken from Latin, the foreign Teutonic words, and the Celtic words. The chapters devoted to French are: ii (pp. 3-22) the Introduction of French words; iii (pp. 23-43) Some Description of Anglo-French; iv (pp. 44-56) Specimens of Anglo-French; v (pp. 57-75) Effects of the English Accent; vi (pp. 76-125) Words of Anglo-French Origin: Examples; vii (pp. 126-136) On some changes in Pronunciation; viii (pp. 137-169) Words of Central French Origin; ix (pp. 170-181) Words of Late French Origin; x (pp. 182-204) French Words of Latin Origin.—The Vowels; xi (pp. 205-238) French Words of Latin Origin.—The Consonants; xii (pp. 239-248) French Words not of Latin Origin. These chapter-headings give some idea of the way in which the author has treated his subject, and I now proceed to some observations of detail, without discussing all the places I had marked, for this would carry me too far.

Page 11. "The old *w* . . . has disappeared in French, its place being supplied by *g*." Of course, *gu* (*g*) was Old French also, the *w* forms belonging to a different dialect. Also the *qu* in Old French was certainly not always pronounced as in Eng. *quit*.—P. 13. "Corpse (*ps* kept)." But the usual Old French form had no *p*, and the true English word representing Old French *cors* is *corse*, now poetical only, while the *p* in *corpse* is due to the etymological French spelling *corps*. The statement on p. 219 is better. To be sure the very oldest French does show *corps*. Why is the pronunciation of *ch* as *sh* in *chivalry* "detestable"? If usage sanctions it (cf. the 'New English Dict.' on *chevalier* and *chivalry*) it is correct, however much it may be opposed to an etymologist's views as to what is historically correct, and however irregular or historically wrong it may really be. It is our business, as linguistic students, to explain, if we can, the actual phenomena of language, but ought we to alter or try to alter the modern forms, even if we think we have a sufficient knowledge of the factors which have operated to produce them, simply because we think some of those factors ought not to have been allowed to exert any influence?—P. 21, §16. Can it

be that Skeat means that Chaucer considered Anglo-French to be as good as Parisian French? Does he think that anybody in England or anywhere else thought so in Chaucer's time? It is hardly necessary to say that the linguistic views here ascribed to Chaucer are more characteristic of the nineteenth century, in which, indeed, they are still far from being common to all persons of education, than of the fourteenth. Further, when on the next page we are told that the French of Paris had but lately risen into importance as a literary language the ordinary reader would hardly suspect that "but lately" is to be understood as meaning about two hundred years before. It might also be asked whether "the language of the English court under a king who claimed to be *also king of France*" was French of "the scode of Stratford atte Bowe."—P. 27. In connection with the statement here made about the work done for Anglo-French forms of English words thence derived, may be mentioned the notice of the 'Rough List' by Visling in the *Literaturblatt*, iv, 464.—P. 29. Laws of William I. The MS. is here ascribed to the thirteenth century, while on p. 44 it is said to be of the twelfth.—P. 30. To Behrens's earlier useful work may now be added his later treatment in Paul's 'Grundriss,' i, p. 799 ff., and Suchier's brief notice of this in the *Literaturblatt*, xii, 53. The table for Anglo-French pronunciation (pp. 37, 38) might be improved by omitting quantitative distinctions for the vowels, as so little is known of Old French and Anglo-French vowel quantities. For *e* and *o* the important thing to note is the difference in quality (*e*, *ê*, *o*, *ô*). Similarly *ii* should be distinguished from *oi* (*ui*), and this from *gi*, particularly where modern French is misleading, as for the word *oyster*, with which compare *usher*, *pew* (as pointing to *üi*). As to *ai* and *ei* the pronunciation was not always diphthongal; cf. the modern English and the varying early spellings, and the treatment of these diphthongs by Behrens. Anglo-Norman was by no means always spelt as it was pronounced, and for this problem we must keep in mind the older French pronunciation which was changing in not quite the same way in the dialects of France, while the influence of the French of France on that of England continued

more or less active, and Anglo-French was itself changing, and was exposed moreover to influences from English, and we must also remember that French words adopted into English were not all adopted or fully naturalized at the same time. Such considerations may help us to understand some of the exceptional or difficult cases mentioned by Behrens, for example, while we can see clearly the general correctness of the laws he gives. When the subject has been more studied we may see results not dissimilar to, but not agreeing entirely with those obtained by Förster for the dialect of Chrétien de Troyes. Skeat himself puts the matter better on p. 40. Is it well to speak of a diphthong *ea*? P. 41 puts it better. The form *oe* (pp. 38 and 42) should be put before *eo*, as being the original one, *eo* being a later variant in spelling after the sound became *e* (or, perhaps, while the sound was *ö*, if that was the intermediary stage). On p. 42 the sound of *eu* in Fr. *peuple* seems to be considered a diphthong ("and then [that is, after having taken the sound of French *eu*] it became a monophthong"). The pronunciation *æy* (*y=ü*) for *eu* it is indeed well to query; it would have been better to leave only the query (or to substitute *eu* for *æy*) and omit the references to Schwan, which can hardly do the reader any good. Several different things are here put together, with no proper regard to what the ground-forms for Anglo-French were in each case, and the cases of *eu* in Schwan's §285 are not mentioned at all. See also Neumann's review of Schwan in Gröber's *Zeitschrift*, xiv, and cf. Skeat's own § 83.

Page 40. "A[nglo] F[rench] *sch* was originally pronounced as written, that is as *s* . . . followed by *ch* (in *charge*), but passed into *sh* (in *shall*); hence the M. E. symbol *sch* for the sound of *sh*." But cf. Eng. *peach*=O. Fr. *pesche*, also *cheat*, *chess*, *checker*, *chine*, by the side of *marshal*, and observe the note on p. 71 of this book, where not quite the same thing is said as here on p. 40. I need not repeat what I have already said on the English sound *ʃ* in words from the French (see MOD. LANG. NOTES, March, 1892, col. 154). The explanation for the M. E. spelling *au* before *n* + cons. suggested by Skeat (p. 41), that it was

caused by the originally nasal sound of the *a*, is far from being certain. Skeat himself says that vowel nasality was "probably soon lost in Anglo-French since English shows but slight traces of it." (What are the "slight traces" meant?) As Skeat says, generally speaking, the Old French nasal vowels do not seem to have left traces in English, and moreover this Anglo-French *au* for older *a* is late Anglo-French, not an early phenomenon. It is at least possible that it was due to some peculiar English influence, which caused the glide from *a* to the following *n* to take on a quality resembling or reaching *u*, and it is not impossible that this may have been caused by the peculiar resonance of the *n* in English pronunciation. The subsequent change of *au* to *a* would in that case be similar to the changes in the case of *chafe* (see Murray, s. v.), *save*, *sage* (the plant), *savage*. Moreover, in the word *jaundice* the *au* was certainly originally a diphthong in France and a true diphthong must once have existed in the case of such words as *laundry*, *laundress*, and probably of *saunter*. Yet these words have developed in Modern English in the same way as *haunt*, *daunt*, and as, in much at least of "standard English," *lance*, *dance*, *aunt*. The other result of the diphthong *au* is shown in the modern sound *ɔ* (as in *awe*), the common value assigned now to the spelling *au* or *aw*; as in *haughty*, *brawn*. It is perhaps worth adding that *laundry* has in Maine, or had there some twenty or thirty years ago, very frequently the value *laundri* with the diphthong *au*, instead of *landri*, and I may remind readers of the Teutonic change of old Aryan vocalic *n* to *un*. Another case of the old diphthong *au* giving *ɔ* is *falcon*, in which, however, the intrusive *l* is now sounded by some. With this view it is comparatively easy to understand the various forms given by Skeat in the other places where he touches on this subject (cf. §§49, 50, 51, 54, 82); except indeed that I have not attempted to explain why *au* has sometimes developed like old *a* and sometimes gives *ɔ*. On this point I have as yet only a suspicion, rather than a fully formed theory; it is not yet ripe for presentation.—P. 41. The *an* in *rank*, *standard*, etc., may be due to Continental influence, *en* and *an* being

in France to a great extent pronounced alike; see also Skeat's remark p. 129, §96, (2). The foot note on p. 126 is not a sufficient explanation; why should *e* in *renc* have had a nasal sound any more than, or one different from that of *e* in the words which gave us *amend*, *tent*, etc.? Cf. also *sample*, pp. 66, 78. In §58 (2), (pp. 85, 86) the matter is again mentioned; such repetitions with more or less variation are frequent and annoying. This fault is somewhat atoned for by the excellent index, in which I have noted only the omission of *use*, p. 47.—P. 41. The two important different sounds of *e* are here recognized, though the treatment is inadequate.—P. 42. In *ie* the *i* can, in general, be neglected for Anglo-French, the change of *ie* to *e* being one of the earliest of Anglo-French peculiarities. One often asks himself in reading, what period of Anglo-French is in the author's mind? The modern English spelling with *ie* is mentioned in §84. An interesting chapter might be written on Old French spellings as explaining present English spellings, and in connection with this might be discussed some cases of spelling influencing pronunciation. The *o* before *m* and *n* in Anglo-French we naturally suppose to have been *ø* (*u* in England), as a general rule. The sound we give to *o* in *compass*, for example, is the regular and proper one for such cases; cf. the different pronunciations now given the *o* in *combat*. On p. 42 an explanation of the spelling with *o* instead of *u* is offered; for a discussion of the sounds as later developed, see §§65, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 87, and, perhaps, other places. The general principles are perfectly simple, and could have been briefly stated and illustrated. But I have already drawn attention to the confused treatment of the *o* and *u* sounds.—P. 43, line 3, "*u* long by position" is a phrase that ought not to be used; it is the syllable, not its vowel, that is long even with the added foot note, the vowel itself being in such cases usually short, though it may be long in spite of position.—P. 59. Either here or somewhere else (for example, in chap. xi) the difference between the final consonants in *advise* (*s*) and *advise* (*z*); *use*, *n.*, and *use*, *v.*; *strife* and *strive* might have been noticed and explained, and the cases of O. Fr. *-t* and *-d-*, for example, dis-

cussed for the words which English adopted. Perhaps this has been done somewhere in the book though I have not found the place; there is no doubt that the author understands the principle, see p. 194.—P. 60. The explanation given of the difference in accent between noun and verb (*conflict*, *convict*, *torment*, etc.) is interesting.—P. 64. Is it true that *scl* passed through *shl* (*ʃl*) on the way to *sl* in *sclandre*, *slander*? I think not.—P. 67. *Eschaete* (for older *-eite*) is an interesting case of survival in English, through a participial noun, of the O. Fr. *p. p.* in *-eit=-ēctum*.—P. 70. *Cœvrir*. Better to write *covrir* or *cuvrir*, in the infinitive.—P. 81. Can the sound *a* (*aa*) in *pass* and similar words be properly called a retention of the Anglo-French sound? It is rather a comparatively late modern development from the sound *æ*, itself regularly descended from Anglo-French or Middle English *a*. Middle English long *a* regularly gives us not *a* (*aa*) but *ei* (*ē*), and if *pass*, etc., did show a retention of the Anglo-French sound of *a* we should have a problem to solve.—P. 84 (§56). "It is weakened to short *i*." The "it" means the *e* in *el*, and not *el* itself, as the language used implies.—P. 91. The spelling *ie* for original *ue*, *oe* in *reprieve*, *retrieve* might have been mentioned here, as well as the *ie*=O. Fr. *ie*, which, as is here said, meant the close *e* sound. The reason is clear enough; namely, O. Fr. *ie* and O. Fr. *ue* both gave in English the same close *e* (*ē*), and the traditional spelling *ie* was sometimes used for this sound, even when the O. Fr. original did not have *ie*. In §84 the author appears to understand what he here misses a clear reason for.—P. 101 (§67). Cases like *butcher* with old *u* preserved may be compared with native words like *full*. The labial consonant is doubtless in part at least the cause; cf. *put*, *bull*, etc. In §68, (2) the modern *fool* points to a Middle English *fōl*, while the O. Fr. vowel was *g*. The change of quality may have been due to the labial *f* or to the *l*, or to both combined. The rarity of the sound *ū* (in *fool*) in modern English words derived from O. Fr. is easily explained, and perhaps the explanation is in this book; one expects to see it here (§68 or in the vicinity) but it is missing, and cases like *move*, *prove*, which are here mentioned ought to have

been explained. In §85 (p. 117) we find something more, but no clear explanation is given there, either.—P. 102. The cases of regular development spoken of in §69 are really not those which have the sound *o* as in *common*, *admonish*, *honor*, etc., as might be inferred, but those mentioned in §67 with the sound heard in *money*, *comfort* (first *o*).—P. 103. In *enfourmer* the *ou* is regular enough as far as the quality (Continental French *o* not *ø*) is concerned, for the *o* was long in Latin, and is so given by Körting ('Lat.-roman. Wörterbuch').—P. 110. In *gule* the vowel was in French *ø*, not *ü*, and the word should accordingly have been put in another place, and the exceptional character of the development of English *gules* noticed.—P. 111, foot note 2. This should rather have been given as the regular mode of formation for words taken from the spoken language, and the statement of the rule might be better.—P. 113, (2). "In a few cases," it is here said, "both *ai* and *ei* have become" long *i* (as in *plea*, *treat*, etc.). There is nothing irregular about this treatment of original French diphthongal *ai* and *ei*, when they had become monophthongs in England in Middle English times, and the language used, which implies something irregular or exceptional, should have been different. Behrens has given a good statement of the laws followed, which explains why we have sometimes long *i* and sometimes *ei* (*ê*), as in *pay*, *vein*; see now Paul's 'Grundriss,' i, pp. 821-823, though it need not be assumed that there are no difficulties left.—P. 113. In *receipt* the *ei* is due to the influence of *receive*, or the French original of the latter word, for the O. Fr. form from which our noun came had *ê* and not (originally) the diphthong. Similar is the case of *deceit*. P. 117. The form *utas* points rather to *utaves* with *ü* for *üi* than to the anomalous and, probably bad spelling, *octaves*. The *ü=üi* shows the diphthong of the simple word *huit*. Instead of such a form as O. Fr. *retreuver*, should be given either the proper infin. *retrover* or a form with the accent on the stem to show the diphthong *oe*, *ue*; for example, *retruevent*. So in other similar cases.—P. 119. For my own dialect *coit* is not a better spelling than *quoit*; is the pronunciation *koit* common in England, or anywhere in this country?—

§87. Only cases of a true diphthong *ou*, or at least of what was previously a diphthong *ou* should be mentioned; such as *ou* in *outrage*.—P. 120. The word *pui* was always a monosyllable in O. Fr. and would have given *pu* (with *ü*) in Anglo-French, whence English *pew* might have regularly descended. But dissyllabic Middle English *pewe* points to O. Fr. *puie*, representing a plural *podia*, and this O. Fr. *puie* is in Godefroy. We are not obliged to assume so strange a thing as that O. Fr. *pui* gave a dissyllabic form *pü-i* in Anglo-French, and that this then gave a Middle English *pew-e*.—P. 123. The wording "evidently because a silent initial *h* before a stressed syllable is opposed to the habits of the language" is queer. What is meant, is that the influence of spelling on pronunciation, here shown, would not have taken place if the vowel had not been accented. But the habits of our language are not at all opposed to an unaspirated accented vowel at the beginning of a word. The spelling of the language is here confused with the language itself.—P. 124. The *z* sound in *measure* comes from *z+y*, the written *su* meaning formerly *zyu*, the *yu* being the regular descendant of Fr. *ü*. The author probably understands the matter, cf. §83, (3).—P. 125. Can the *s* in *viscount* ever have had the sound of *z*? It is difficult to believe it.—P. 127. The pronunciation marked for the Middle English form of *judge* has at least one misprint, *g* for *j*. The *u* may be intentional.—P. 128. The case of *room*, with its exceptional long *u*, is perhaps a secondary lengthening from *rum* (with *u* as in *bull*), a pronunciation known both in England and this country, and itself due, perhaps, to a previous shortening of the original long vowel, the sound *u* being then kept under the influence of the labial *m*.

The substance of Chap. vii can be indicated by saying that sounds of Anglo-French origin, the words once naturalized in English, developed regularly in the same way as the same sounds similarly situated in native words. It would be well to change or query some of the Anglo-French pronunciations given, and to revise the conclusions that follow the lists, but I have touched on some of the most important points already. I pass rapidly over Chapters viii and ix, with the interesting remarks on the

language of Chaucer, of Lydgate, of Caxton, of Shakspeare, and particularly of Dryden. Notice the misprint "phthysic" (p.154).—P.158. *Gimnal* (-bit) is, I believe, marked in at least one dictionary as pronounced with *g*, as in *get*; this seems to be a modern mistake.—P. 166. "*Ritornella*, as in Italian." I know only *ritornello*.—P. 173. The letter *a* in French represents two well-recognized sounds, not one only.—P. 178. The Eng. suffix -*oon* cannot be a survival of the Anglo-French form of the O. Fr. suffix -*ou*; for that, if the accent had remained on the last syllable, would have given words rhyming now, as in Middle English, with *town*. The last sentence in the paragraph is unwarranted.—P. 181. To speak of the loss of a mute *l* is odd.

Chapters x, xi, xii deal with the history of French phonology. There is here far too much detail, the really essential phenomena and the most important laws not being made properly prominent. It is unfortunate that Schwan's assumption of a Gallic Low Latin sound *ω* for classic Latin *au* has been followed.—P. 193. The paragraph numbered eight, shows a lack of acquaintance with phonetics, and it is a lack which is lamentably common.—Pp. 199-204. Only the regular changes for popular words should have been given, and, for example, *e* for Latin "free tonic" *ē*, *æ* should have been omitted.—P. 212. What is said of *genteel* is not exact. It is here said that the "Middle English *gentil* has split into distinct forms, according to the accent; viz., *gentle* and *genteel*. The latter is valuable as showing a survival of the old pronunciation of E[ng]. *i*." A previous mention of *genteel* occurs on p. 175, in the chapter on words from modern French. The inconsistency is obvious, and the incorrectness of the statement on p. 212 equally so.—P. 229 refers to "*L* with *y*, p. 230" for *lentil*, but no explanation is there given.—P. 231. Unintelligible is the remark about the Normans as having no difficulty in pronouncing Lat *w* (*uiperam*), when we reflect that this Latin *w* had long before become *v*, so that there was no Lat. *uipera* in existence. Was there in this case influence of a Teutonic form early borrowed from Latin and so having initial *w*?—P. 240. Schwan's remarks are on the phonology of Greek loan-words in Folk-

Latin, not in French. This should be noted lest Skeat's remark that "the Greek here spoken of is the late or Byzantine Greek, rather than that of the classical period," be understood as meaning that these words are of comparatively modern origin. Some of the words are certainly pretty old. Schwan well says that these Greek words entered Folk-Latin "zu sehr verschiedenen zeiten."—P. 284. O. Fr. *vorice* is not regularly formed for the descendant of Lat. *nutricem*; see the reference given by Körting for an explanation of the real source of the O. Fr. word. This example occurs in the chapter on words of Latin origin, after the French element has been disposed of.—P. 304. It would have been better to omit the *z* for Italian, and also the line following.—P. 305. The example *justo* is not good, in that it implies that *justo* is a recognized and not uncommon Italian word, for no others ought to be used as examples. Better would be *pajo* (also spelt *paio*), or the whole line might be omitted. *Cielo* is not pronounced with a close *e*.—P. 307. The spelling *c(i)* in *judc(i)are*, *manc(i)are* is clumsy, and not very clear. Cf. on these words Körting, 'Lat. roman. Lex.,' *manduco*, with the forms and references there given.—P. 309. In *florin* (English) is not the *l* due to a Low Latin form, or to knowledge of the etymology? It would be better to omit the remark, as it implies that *florin* is Italian, or at least that the Italian word has *fl*. There are several words in this chapter which suggest queries, but I pass them by with the general remark that for Italian, as for French, there is too much detail, and only really plain and clear principles should have been given and illustrated.

In the chapter on Spanish it would have been best to follow Knapp on pronunciation, instead of mixing Knapp's statements with those of P. Foerster when they are in contradiction, as in the "exceptional case" (which as such and as looking very improbable even to a tyro, should have been omitted) of the pronunciation of *escena* with *s* as Eng. *z* and *c* as Eng. *th* (in *that*), and also as in the immediately preceding remark about *z* (p. 332). Araujo's first article on Spanish pronunciation in the *Phonetische Studien* was probably unknown to Skeat when this book was publish-

ed.—P. 320. *Savanna* is not from the Greek through Lat. and Span. (cf. pp. 337, 341 for Skeat's whole view), cf. the accent of the Span. word and its meaning, see Littré., s. v. *savane* (in the *Supplément*) where, however, a correction for reference to the edition of Las Casas, 'Historia de las Indias,' now in print, Madrid, 1875-76, is called for; it is in Book I, chap. 91 or vol. ii, p. 35 that the passage occurs: "al pié del asiento de esta fortaleza está un llano gracioso, que los indios llaman çabana." I may also mention as of possible value in this connection an article in the New York *Nation*, 1885, vol. xl, p. 508. There is a Span. *sabana*, accented on the second syllable, which does correspond to our word, and is this *çabana* in modern spelling. *Paragon* (same page) is spoken of as from Span., while on p. 335 we see that Tobler's etymology is known to Skeat, and is spoken of as the probable solution. It should have been added, therefore, that Tobler does not derive Span. *paragon*, *parangon* immediately from Greek, but thinks the word was brought from Italy into Spain. Skeat's quotation from Minsheu (1623) does not prove that our word came immediately from Span.; it may have come from French which also had the word in the sixteenth century; it was in use in English before 1623.—P. 321. Interesting are the remarks on *garble* with the correction of Godefroy. I have already mentioned some statements about Span. pronunciation; there are also inconsistencies; cf. what is said of the sounds of *z* and *c*, p. 323, §226 (*z* pronounced as *s* is apparently considered the Spanish pronunciation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), p. 333 ("ç=ts?") and the remarks on Eng. *lasso*, and p. 436, where we read: "but it seems clear that in the sixteenth century, Span. *ç* and *z* both had the sound of *z* in *zone*." And in the same sentence, further on, is added: "that *ll* had the modern Italian, not the modern Spanish sound; and that *x* had the old sound of E[ng]. *x* in *mix*, though it, probably, soon passed into *sh*." The idea of different dialect developments of older *ç* and *z* might naturally have suggested itself to explain cases like *lasso*, but no such idea seems to have occurred to the author. No comment is needed on the last words quoted.

There is much that is good in this book, and the main cause for regret is that more time was not given to its preparation, so as to make it, as it might have been made, very much better. As it is, it at least contains a large number of examples, and will show the great importance of the French element in our language, and future writers on that subject will be likely to utilize much of its material, while it may be doubted whether they will have such a knowledge of Middle English as Skeat.

I have never studied any work from his hand without profit, and if in the present case the profit has been less than I had hoped, the reason is that the work was done in a field where he is not quite at home.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph.D., Litt. D., Professor of English in the College of New Jersey. Funk & Wagnall's Company, New York: 1892, 8vo, 384 pp.

THE aim of Dr. Hunt's book is to counteract the chilling and repressive influence of the dominant, materialistic philosophy, as speculative and unethical, upon the poetic instincts. "If English literature comes more and more into union with modern materialism its doom is sealed." He finds "the precedent of the present tendency in the period when English Deism was at its height and the speculative reason usurped the place of simple faith."

There is no abstract discussion of the relation of morality to literature, but in the course of his historic review he shows, as they arise, that the best literary products of the English mind are ethical. The dependence of literature upon its moral contents and spirit for its power, dignity, and æsthetic value is assumed. Dewey is quoted: "no poetry can be good, even in an æsthetic sense, which is divorced from the moral principle."

He seeks to counteract the enfeebling influence of the materialistic philosophy upon English literature in particular, by showing that the constitutional bias of the mind of the English race received from *the ethical teachings*

of its *first and formative* period, when "the moral element is ever visible," is ethical. Its highest artistic results, in agreement with Taine's theory of art, is in the line of its own constitutional bias and spirit. The English mind will work more genially and powerfully, and achieve its highest and purest literary triumphs when it works in a moral spirit and upon moral truth.

It is not necessary for Dr. Hunt, therefore, to review the literature from the Reformation and the age of Elizabeth to show that it is distinctively ethical, with the solitary exception of the literature of the Restoration, the exceptional character of which disappears in view of the literary strength of the minority.

He limits his review to the period from Beowulf to Ascham as the first and *formative* period. He shows in a succession of most interesting chapters that, during this period, the English mind was under Christian culture, evangelical, independent, and protesting. "From the days of Cædmon to the Norman Conquest, and still on to the time of Chaucer and Caxton, most of the best prose and poetry was ethical, if not, indeed, distinctly religious in character." In regard to Beowulf, Dr. Hunt claims that the general cast of the poem is ethical. "It is more than that, and may be said to be profoundly serious and earnest." "There are tendencies and teachings far from unchristian, and which go far to establish a basis on which positively Christian doctrine may be founded." "Most of the ethical element is undoubtedly due to the Anglo-Danish paraphrast."

In distinct chapters, he reviews the Bible and Homily in Old English, Cædmon's, Bede's, Alfred's, Cynewulf's, Layamon's, Orm's, Richard de Bury's, and Richard Rolle's writings, the teachings of the School, and the church, and Old English laws and proverbs. These chapters form the First Part, in which he makes it clearly evident, as was done by Soames in his labors in this field, that the ethical teachings of the Anglo-Saxon church were evangelical, independent and protesting. Dr. Hunt refers this, in large degree, to the influence of the native British church, but allows that "the missionary movements from Rome became fully established ere departures, more

or less important, from the earliest type of the Latin church began to be manifest." Whether due to the British church or to the character of the comparatively pure Christianity of the first Roman missionaries, Anglo-Saxon Christianity maintained throughout its entire period a character quite distinct and peculiar. As has been said by an eminent authority, "of all the literatures of modern Europe, the English felt the influence of Christianity in its purest form."

In a Second Part, Dr. Hunt reviews the literature from Chaucer to Ascham, in chapters on Chaucer, the 'Cursor Mundi,' the Stage, Mandeville, Wiclif, Langland, Gower, Caxton, Latimer, Tyndale, and Ascham, with concluding chapters of great interest upon the English Bible and the English language.

It is necessary for the force of his argument that Dr. Hunt should show that the continuity of English literature was not broken by the Conquest. Here, as in his history of English prose, he maintains the continuity with great and convincing earnestness. He exhibits the transmission of these teachings, not only through tradition, but through literature, in Layamon, and Orm, and Rolle. Though much of the literature of this transitional period is translation from the French, it is the translation of the ethical writings of the French, in the ethical spirit of the English. Dr. Hunt has rescued the literature of this period from the contempt it has received as only valuable for philological uses. He does not claim for the literature of the period preceding the age of Elizabeth an artistic form. The English mind was too deeply concerned with the spirit and stuff of literature to give attention to fine form. The historic order in the development of the true, the good, and the beautiful in English literature followed the logical order. As Shedd says:

"The same degree of careful effort devoted to the artistic and formal finish of a work AFTER, instead of before, the proper diligence and care have been devoted to its material origination within the mind, will elaborate it into a high beauty and an exquisite grace, that are absolutely beyond the power of one who has not thus begun at the beginning."

This applies to the common as truly as to the individual mind. The ethical English

mind in its maturity, and in the "fulness of times," under classical influence expressed itself in the finest form.

Dr. Hunt's claim of a high ethical character for Chaucer will, perhaps, be rejected by some. Arnold deposes him from his literary position for his alleged want of seriousness. Lounsbury, in his "Studies in Chaucer," presents his views in the following abstracts: "The evidence indicates that Chaucer's mind passed through several phases, but that towards the end doubt and denial became its leading characteristics." He concedes that "the evidence is scanty" but insists that "it is equally fair to say that it cannot be expected to be otherwise than scanty." Lounsbury finds in Chaucer "an audaciousness in his reference to the Supreme Being," shocking to the devout, and "a familiarity of tone coming perilously near to the verge of blasphemy." Yet he recognizes the fact "that he was profoundly interested in the questions connected with doctrinal theology. The problems which still disquiet the intellect, and after the solution of which we grope in vain in the soul's own darkness, were the ones that were perpetually present to his mind." This seems like a concession to an ethical element in Chaucer.

Dr. Hunt has effectively shown that in each of the eras reviewed in the two parts into which his work is divided,

"a distinctive and an ever-increasing Christian element is visible; so prominent, at times, as to control the current speech, and never so in abeyance as to be without decided potency. So manifest, indeed, is this to the discerning student of our oldest literature that it is not unhistorical to say that Old English, taken as a whole, is more biblical and ethical in its tone than it is secular, and might be assigned, as to much of it, to the alcoves of theology and morals, of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology."

Dr. Hunt's work thus becomes a valuable contribution to the philosophy of English literature. He has shown in the ethical teachings of the earliest period the influence of the agencies in the formation of the established bias and spirit of the English mind, and the essential characteristic of English literature, which has made it "the most thoughtful, the most vigorous, and the most vitalizing literature of the modern world."

He refers this characteristic not to the "soil, sea, sky, and climate" of England, to which Taine so largely refers it, but, recognizing these material conditions as predisposing influences, he refers the ethical character to the providential and historic tuition of its formative period. This serves as a strong justification of the attention given to the earlier literature in English studies. The student drinks at the fountain head from the source of the power and dignity of our great literature.

CHARLES E. HART.

Rutgers College.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

Studier over engelske Kasus. I Række. Med en Indledning: Fremskridt i Sproget. Af OTTO JESPERSEN, Copenhagen: Kleins Forlag, 1891. Pp. 222.

DR. JESPERSEN'S first series of studies of the English case is one of the most careful pieces of work in this direction yet produced in Danish. The author has collected a vast amount of material from the earliest to the latest period of the language, showing an intimate knowledge of our tongue that is very rare in a foreigner. His first independent work was an English grammar, published in 1885, since which time he has brought out a number of monographs on various linguistic subjects. Valuable as the treatment of the English case is, however, the chief interest of the work undoubtedly centers in the introduction, "Progress in Language," which forms more than a quarter of the whole, and in which the author attempts to prove the grammatical superiority of modern English over Old English, of analytical languages over synthetic, of root languages over inflectional. In connection with this theory, or, perhaps, as a logical consequence of it, he undertakes also to overthrow the theory that the inflectional, agglutinative and root families of languages represent three stages of development, of which the last is the most primitive.

To take up the first question, the superiority of modern English to old English as a means of communication. While the author is perfectly correct in his statement that speech is the effort to make one's meaning intelligible and that, therefore, "that language stands

highest that accomplishes most with the least means" his enthusiasm for his subject makes him go altogether too far. It is no doubt true that "a result of inflections is irregularities, exceptions," but he seems to forget that the lack of inflection leads to precisely the same trouble. Thus the whole system of concord, which, as Jespersen says, is a necessary accompaniment of inflection, while causing mental effort to the speaker, certainly serves to make the meaning clearer to the hearer. It takes at least two persons to make a conversation, that is, an interchange of ideas, and the claims of the one are quite as urgent as those of the other. To cite one example, which figures in almost every English Rhetoric as a violation of clearness: "And thus the son the fervid sire address'd." The use of a separate form for nominative and accusative would clear up the ambiguity immediately. The presence of inflectional forms often causes awkwardness, especially in the use of the pronoun, but this is not sufficient to prove the superiority of an analytical to a synthetic language. Dr. Jespersen's Z. E. D. is by no means a necessary conclusion.

In attempting to disprove the theory of the primitiveness of root languages, Dr. Jespersen has recourse to a family of languages whose study is comparatively rare, that of South Africa. In one of these he finds a very complicated system of inflection, in some respects more complicated and consistent than that of any of the Indo-European languages. Especially is this the case with the so-called "representative elements," or prefixes, which are reducible to separate classes, their use being strictly limited by the construction. Particularly interesting is the author's too brief comparison of Bruocotti à Vetralle's grammar of one of these languages written two hundred years ago with Bleek's grammar of the language in its present state, which shows a decided simplification of the forms. Jespersen concludes, furthermore, that it is possible to find in these languages the growth of the pronominal idea and of many other grammatical forms. He concludes, and this is the turning point of the whole argument, that this grammatical development has been effected in every case by a shortening and

simplification, instead of by an expansion. Therefore, if this be the case with a primitive language like the Hottentot or the Zulu, why cannot the same hold good of all other languages? "Simplicity in linguistic formation . . . is, therefore, not original but derived" (p. 41). In support of the statement as regards the Indo-European family, he quotes from Brugmann's treatise on the gender of the noun and Johan Schmidt's 'Die Pluralbildungen der indog. Neutra.' Paul, in his 'Principles of the History of Language,' to whom Jespersen does not refer, does not, however, seem to lend support to any such belief, though no more direct statement than the following can be found in his great work:

"we cannot, of course, suppose that analogy coöperated in this manner in the case of the first creations with which language began. No trace of any grammatical category is seen in them. They answer to entire conceptions. They are primitive sentences of which we may form an idea from such sentences as fire! thieves! spoken in a single word." (P. 184).

Dr. Jespersen is by no means alone in his theory that Chinese may be regarded as representing the last stage in a series of linguistic changes. While J. Edkins in his work 'The Evolution of the Chinese Language' (1888), still clings to the old idea, Lepsius, writing thirty-one years ago, and Ernst Kuhn but nine years ago, come to the directly opposite conclusion, that Chinese has not always been a root language. Jespersen, however, again goes too far when he claims that it would be impossible for a primitive people to employ so logical a system of language as that of the Chinese, in which each word has its fixed position.

Curiously enough, the only misstatement with regard to linguistic forms noticed, concerns the author's own tongue. It is not correct to say that "in the present Danish speech we distinguish the singular and plural of *Dag* only by the presence or absence of the stop tone." I am sure that the most careless speaker would pronounce *Dage* as a dissyllable, although the final *-e* is frequently very indistinct. In the study of the English pronouns, to which this first series is devoted, the author has shown both skill in his choice of selections and care in their reproduction.

Even the varying forms of the Early and Middle English are given with absolute correctness. On page 177, Dr. Jespersen has introduced a very useful phonetic term into Danish, *stemmelse* (voicing), for which his apologetic foot note is hardly necessary. The discussion of the confusion in the use of the nominative and objective is particularly sound and valuable for Danish readers. It is somewhat in the nature of a defence of the position taken by the author in his English grammar, for the schoolmaster is abroad in Denmark as well as in America. Jespersen's treatment of the Scandinavian influence on Old English (p. 97) is remarkably temperate for a Dane. His suggestion that Eienkel's frequently excessive claims for French influence on English syntax may often be disproved by citing similar Danish constructions, is valuable, even though, as he himself admits, such resemblances do not necessarily imply direct Scandinavian influence. Not the least virtue of the work is the admirable table of contents, which almost takes the place of an index. Dr. Jespersen's second series will be looked forward to with interest.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

POETRY AND PHILOSOPHY.

Kuno Fischer und die litterarhistorische Methode. Von HUGO FALKENHEIM, DR. PHIL. Berlin: Speyer & Peters, 1892, pp. 107.

THE object of Falkenheim's monograph, as set forth in the Preface, is to attempt to establish the principles of a method which shall be a guide to a scientific understanding and appreciation of German poetry. Its rather strange title is due to the fact, that the author believes to have discovered these principles in the critical works of Kuno Fischer on Lessing, Schiller and Goethe. The title is not a happy one, as it may arouse the opposition of some critics to whom Kuno Fischer is not a *persona grata*; furthermore, it is misleading. For the value of the essay lies in the principles of literary criticism deduced from Fischer's books, and not in the discussion and analysis of Fischer's methods.

It would be impossible within the limits of a

book review to discuss, or even comment upon, principles of such far-reaching importance, for this would require at least as much space as the author has taken for their exposition. As such a method, however, cannot be limited to German literature, but is universal in its application, it will not be without value to follow the main lines of the views here presented, in the hope that the presentation of these may lead to a careful reading of the book, which is full of suggestions on all matters pertaining to the critical study of literature, though all might not agree with its chief deductions.

The author asserts, as the underlying principle of his method, that poetry and philosophy are intimately connected in their nature. This principle he demonstrates by an analysis of the character of both, and by the fact, that so many German poets have written purely philosophical works, and that all poets have embodied in their poetic creations great philosophic principles, and in their poetry have touched upon all the great problems of human life. Therefore, without the foundation of a knowledge of philosophy, the domains of classical German literature cannot be explored in their full extent; and, if literary criticism rejects philosophic thinking, that is, the philosophic method, it cannot rise to the full appreciation of its problems, and, hence, cannot solve them. The study of the history of literature is a philosophic process; it consists in investigating the principles of the internal development and the organic growth of literature. He who would write a history of literature must combine the qualities of the historian, of the psychologist and of the literary critic pure and simple. Every author must be considered from three standpoints. He must be viewed in relation to his nation; must be assigned his proper place in the history of that nation's literature and civilization. He must be discussed as the man, as a personality. He must be considered as the poet, or rather his works must be judged by themselves as artistic productions, and criticised from the purely literary standpoint. The relative importance of these elements of literary judgment varies, but they all require consideration.

Now, in regard to the first point. No judg-

ment can be fairly passed upon any author without a clear understanding of his relations to his nation and to his own times; whether or not he is in sympathy with the spirit of the times, and how far he helps to solve its great problems and to advance the cause of civilization and progress. To such an understanding, a thoroughly philosophical knowledge of that nation's history is necessary, particularly of its literary history. The great poets stand for and embody, so to speak, that which is greatest and best in their times, and, like heirs, take up and carry forward the work of civilization from one generation to another in unbroken succession. There is then a historical dependence of poets upon another, which shows itself in similar views, in similar subjects, in similar *motifs*, which are transmitted from one to another, perhaps directly borrowed. But the present tendency to attach such great importance to the discovery of such similarities is utterly wrong. For, from a strictly historical standpoint, such discoveries are of value only as they throw light upon the state of thought and culture of the period in question, or upon the general trend of the intellectual life of the nation.

But the poet has an existence and a history apart from that of his nation. To pass judgment upon him, it is, therefore, necessary to know him as an individual personality, as a "spiritual monad," and to know his personal development. Two things are necessary to such knowledge: a psychological analysis of the poet's inborn character and talents; and further, a detailed knowledge of his antecedents and of the facts of his personal history. The mere knowledge of facts, without any understanding of their bearing upon the development of the author as a man and poet, is fruitless; and the collection and compilation of such facts is almost useless labor.

In regard to the relation existing between the external facts of a poet's life and his poetry, Falkenheim holds, that poetry is the expression of the inward life of the poet and not mere reproduction of impressions from nature. All impressions from the outside world pass through the prism of poetic imagination and receive their coloring from this. Many writers on literature utterly fail to ap-

preciate this, and are lead to commit all kinds of extravagances in their attempts to fix minutely the persons who have furnished traits for the poet's characters, or to establish the exact scenes of his poems. The critic needs a philosophical mind to appreciate the transforming power of poetic fancy, to estimate correctly the influence of external events upon the development of the poet's genius, to recognize the close relation between life and poetry without binding himself to the dogma, that art and poetry merely reproduce nature and do nothing more.

A poet's life and his works, however, stand in a close relation, inasmuch as the latter are the result of agitated states of the mind, which seeks by poetic creation to free itself from its passions. Therefore, all poetry is a "Confession" and, to understand the poet's soul-life and inner development, it is necessary to analyse his poetry with this fact in view. Such psychological analysis, moreover, frequently establishes the relations between different poems, or parts of the same poem, with greater certainty than can be reached by external evidence. External evidence is of value, but how misleading it may prove is shown by the great mistakes which have been made in the discussion of the "Faust-question" by the keenest of critics.

With the present tendency of literary investigation to devote almost all its time and labor to the searching out of the "sources" of poetical works, to seeking to trace to their origin all episodes, ideas and passages which a poet may have gathered in his reading of other poets and utilised in his own works, Falkenheim has little sympathy. Such studies frequently lead to the greatest absurdities, besides failing entirely to take into account the creative imagination of the poet. Aside from the fact, that various explanations may be frequently found for such similarities of thought and expression, we are not so much interested in knowing where the poet found his materials as in knowing what use he has made of them. A philosophical method of criticism puts a just estimate upon the value of such material; the philological method, as now applied, unduly magnifies its importance and is apt to mislead the student. It is a mistake

of the same general nature to group poets into "schools," to assert dogmatically the dependence of one poet upon another, to cite indiscriminately analogous and contradictory passages of the same or of different poets. All such practices are misleading, because they are apt to lose sight of the power of originality in the poetic imagination.

Literary criticism, pure and simple, the third of the elements of literary judgment, when based upon careful preliminary historical and psychological analysis, is, according to Falkenheim, the consummation of literary investigation. For the history of literature "reaches its highest point when conceived of as the history of the development of national æsthetic ideals in the realm of poetry as reflected in the representative poets and their works." In practice, the process of passing judgment upon any author is as follows. First comes the critical estimate of his productions, an estimate corrected and ratified by the facts of his life, and then the author is assigned his proper rank amongst the poets of his nation. Therefore, purely literary criticism is the Alpha and the Omega of literary investigation.

Literary criticism requires taste and discrimination, intuitive æsthetic appreciation, a soul which is itself poetical. Mechanical dissection can never comprehend life. The first thing to be aimed at in the interpretation of any poem is to understand its spirit, its organic structure, and not, as the philologists of to-day would have it, its form or its style. Form is secondary to thought; the critic should pass criticism upon the *union of form and thought*, to explain how the poet cast into its harmonious form this creation of his "fine phrenzy."—Philology has its place in literary investigations, often the most important place, and should do the preliminary work in all literary study; but it ought not, on the ground of being the "exact" method, assert its superiority over all other methods, which, because they are not mechanical, it contemptuously calls unscientific. All honor is due to philology, because it has so rigidly insisted upon accuracy and attention to detail, but to-day it is lost in its details and fails to see the woods because of the trees.

The great objection urged against æsthetic

literary criticism is its indefiniteness. It cannot be defined exactly; it is difficult to resolve it into its elements, to establish canons of criticism which will be accepted by all. The objection is partly true, yet receives most of its support from mistakes of incapable critics. Scientific criticism requires a naturally critical mind educated in the principles of art and philosophy, trained by a study of artistic productions. There are general laws underlying all poetic creations according to which the poet's mind works and creates, and which it is the aim of æsthetics to discover in order to base upon them canons of criticism. There are certain of these views accepted by all writers in literary matters, for all make distinctions between greater and lesser poets, and none would think of chronicling *all* facts about *all* authors. The criticism of a poem requires more than mere analysis. Having penetrated to the heart of the poem and discovered the law of its organism, the critic should proceed to the reconstruction, the *synthesis*, of the poem according to its organic laws. In this process he can appreciate the value of its form, can judge whether form and thought are in harmony, can condemn such parts as are not in keeping with, or extraneous to, the rest of the poem.

Falkenheim sums up his results as follows:

"The justification of our method lies in the fact that while it attempts to find the solution of the problems of the history of literature by an analysis of the peculiar character and nature of this history, it avoids the one-sidedness of former methods, of which, however, it preserves the important features and which it takes up and embodies in newer and higher principles. . . . In such a method the spirit always counts for more than the letter."

He acknowledges that there are weak points in the method, that Kuno Fischer, its great exponent, is often one-sided, and, perhaps, dogmatic, but maintains that the method, if properly applied, is its own check.

Such, in the main, are the views of the author. Whatever opinion may be held of the worth and correctness of his views, the author is entitled to great praise for the honesty and fairness of his discussion; the clear, logical exposition of his views and his straightforward, agreeable style. Kuno Fischer, as the best

representative of the method, necessarily takes up a great deal of space in the discussion, and his books furnish many illustrative examples. The tone, however, in which the "master" is spoken of, is always moderate; there is in it the warm feeling of a devoted pupil towards his teacher, but nowhere fulsome flattery or dogmatic condemnation of dissenting opinions. The great merit of the book is, that it joins so vigorously and powerfully in the increasing protests against the mechanical, life-destroying methods of literary criticism which are prevalent in Germany and threaten to reduce the investigation and study of literature in our colleges and universities to the merest mechanical grubbing for facts, without any consideration of the thought and beauty of the poetic creations.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Yale University.

ICELANDIC LEXICOGRAPHY.

Ordförrådet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna leksikaliskt ock gramatiskt ordnat av Dr. LUDVIG LARSSON. Lund: Ph. Lindstedts Universitets-Bokhandel. 1891, 4to, pp. v, 438.

DR. LARSSON'S work is a decidedly valuable addition to Icelandic lexicography, filling a want that had long been felt. It contains complete references to all forms occurring in the following MSS.:

1. Reykjaholts málðage, or málðagi, as it is written in the MS. itself.
2. Arnamagnsan MS., 237 fol.
3. The oldest portion of Codex 1812, 4to, Gl. Kong. Saml.
4. The glossaries in the Arnamag. MS., 249 fol.
5. 15, 4to, Stockholm. Book of Homilies.
6. Fragments of "Phisiologus, Arnamag." MS., 673 A, 4to.
7. The older portion of Arnamag. MS., 645, 4to.
8. Arnamag. MS., 674, 4to, A.
9. " " 673, 4to, B.
10. " " 315, fol. D.

The last three MSS. contain respectively *Eleucidarius*, *Placitusdrápa* and *Grágás*.

Some idea of the magnitude of the work and the minuteness of its execution can be formed from the statement that the references to the single word *at* in its various uses cover over twelve columns, one of these columns containing, by actual count, four hundred and twenty-five references, while the pronoun *sá* takes up twenty columns, or between eight and ten thousand references. The form of the catch words is normalized according to the oldest orthography that commonly occurs in the MSS., while the different forms of the same word are arranged according to their age, and when this is the same the least abbreviated form is given first. The different MSS. are, furthermore, treated separately, convenient abbreviations being employed to distinguish them. At the back of the book are lists of foreign proper names and common nouns that do not receive Icelandic inflectional endings. Finally, all the native words occurring in the dictionary are grammatically arranged in accordance with Noreen's 'Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik.' This is especially valuable in connection with the nouns.

A careful comparison of the words under the letter *A* with those occurring in Vigfussen's Dictionary shows the following omissions and errors in the latter and, at the same time, indicates the usefulness of Larsson's work, especially for grammatical purposes:—

akenningr, masc., given only as fem., -ing.
aldentré, *algeorva*, *almildr*, *ástfrænnkona*,
ásthuge (*ástarhúge*, however, is given by V.),
ástskýrpr, *ástvitispr*.

As the value of a work of this kind depends entirely upon the correctness of its references, I have compared the forms occurring in the Icelandic-Latin glossary, numbered Gl. ii., with Dr. Larsson's transcriptions, and for want of a more complete comparison, this may be taken as a fair test of the compiler's skill. The forms are cited from the edition published in "Smaastykker" of the society for the publication of Old Norse Literature, 1884, by Gudmund Porláksson. This particular work was chosen mainly on account of its shortness. Under '*af*, casus osäker,' it should be noted that the case, dative sing., is given in the

citation of the governed word *samhuilo*; *bolle* is omitted, though *hlannbolle* is cited from 1812; *i*, which is given as uncertain as regards the case, governs the acc., according to the reference to *hel*. There are, furthermore, several words, *hor hus*, *fe hus*, written as one word in the dictionary, that occur as separate words in the text. If, however, the rest of the work is as carefully done as this portion examined, and a hasty comparison of portions of the *Máldagi*, and of 1812 would indicate that it is, Dr. Larsson is to be congratulated on having successfully performed a most difficult and troublesome task. It should be noted, in conclusion, that the mechanical execution of the work is admirable, the paper being good and plenty of it, the print large and clear.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BEEKENES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The number for September 20th, 1892, of *L'Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux* (which occasionally discusses points of philological interest with its historical and literary contents) has the following:—

“Un vieux mot du xiv^e siècle.—Parmi les copies rapportées de Londres par Brequigny, à la fin du siècle dernier, se trouve, sous la date de 1398, une requête au roi et au parlement d'Angleterre, par le trésorier de Calais, au sujet des réparations nécessaires au port de cette ville. Je relève dans ce document le passage suivant:

Y sont deux grosses overaignes les pluies nécessaires de tout dys estre sustenuz et supportez; c'est assavoir les *beekenes* devant le port illocques et le lieu appelle Paradys, q'est bien près les fosses de mesmes la ville. . . .

Dans notre vieux français, quel est le sens de ce mot *beekenes* qui est reproduit quatre fois dans le document en question? Il s'agit très probablement d'un môle (angl. mole, head), ou d'une jetée, estacade; mais les vieux noms de ces ouvrages n'ont aucun rapport avec *beekenes*.

E. M.

This raises an interesting question, as neither Littré nor other authorities furnish the word

nor forms akin to it, and as state documents, particularly those dealing with ordinary public works or improvements, scarcely employ “verba insolita,” but use terms either well-known or of easy interpretation by the general run of governmental servants. Yet it would seem, as I have communicated to the *Intermédiaire*, that the meaning of the word is both simple and sure, since the sound, and the sense of the context each furnish an analogy with which to start. *Beekenes* is evidently the M. E. *bekene*, found in ‘P. Plowman,’ B. xvii, 262 (quoted by Skeat), and the equivalent of the A.-S. *bedcen*, and the modern *beacon* (kindred with *beck* and *beckon*). If we accept the derivation assigned (cf. Skeat), whose radical has, besides the idea of “signal,” that of “fire” as the means of communicating the sign, the connection between the root and the specific words in French: (1) ‘falot’; (2) ‘fanal’; (3) ‘phare’ would be quite as possible and probable as the derivation of *beacon* through a reduplicated \sqrt{qa} or, anteriorly, \sqrt{BHA} ; since *beekenes* would then=‘phare’ (whose historic origin does not invalidate the principle). But the term must have been of English importation. For (a) English political predominance at the time naturally affected the districts subject to it in France; and (b) it is no mere coincidence that the passage quoted from ‘P. Plowman’ should be exactly contemporaneous with the date assigned. If I recall rightly, texts A, B, C (the last fixed by its reference to Richard), all fall within the compass of the same half-century which shows the French word. Putting together derivation and the two historical side-lights—more of which could, doubtless, be verified—we may say with safety that *beekenes*=‘beacons,’ that is, the ‘phares’ of Calais, “devant le port illocques.”

On the other hand, but with less certainty, we might assign another source for the word [tho’ noticing that it must be of Northern origin, as neither the Centre (cf. Jaubert) nor the ‘Midi’ have forms of affinity, nor do we find the slightest resemblances in Provençal speech]. The ‘Patois du Nord’ has *la becque*, ‘le ruisseau.’ This is evidently from the German *Bach*, English *Beck*, whose Dutch form *Beek* might give us the start in *beekenes*.

For (1) that an unaccented syllable should have dropped from some lost word which might have had connection with *beck*, 'stream,' in its more Teutonic forms, is not impossible, nor (2) that, granting *beck* to keep its meaning of 'rivulet,' this short form might not have been assimilated to *beacon*, which (a) constant contact with sailors along the shores of the German ocean could have transported to the Calais district, or, (b) the continuous domination of the English would have incorporated into the language, especially in official relations; the more so, as similarity of sound would lead to confusion of the idea involved, and the difference between the jetty supporting the *beacon*, and the stream itself projecting into the sea, is not so wide as to avoid possible misconception. Nor is this view without greater foundation than chance or the analogy of what has often been the result of a mistaken law of assimilation. For (cf. Godefroy, 'Dict. l'Anc. Lang. Franç.') we find *la beke*, or *la becque*, in the sense of 'égout,' 'sewer,' where (a) the connection with the point just indicated, is clear, the *beck* or 'stream' emptying itself, and then, by extension, the word becoming applied to artificial exits or conduits. Whence, (b) assimilation with the English word, by metonymy, taking the *beacon* at the end of the mole to indicate the mole itself, and then the same confusion of terms arising as above.

But, three, we find in a long passage (too much so for quoting) cited from the "Ordonnances des Rois de France, T. ii," 207 (cf. La Curne de Sainte Palaye, 'Dict. Hist. de l'Ancien Language François'), the word *bec* or *becques*, meaning in this connection 'la crête d'un fossé' 'une levée de terres' where *bec*=*beak* (Eng.) and the idea of the definition is perfectly plain, *bec* being the crest of earth, mountain or ditch, as *bec*, 'nose,' is the projection of the face. The same process would here occur; *beeken* being the projection either upward or outward, from the view of the horizontal or vertical, and assimilation occurring through confusion of sound. The last two suggestions may be fanciful to too great a degree. They are not impossible. And in the predominance of English rule, where particularly improvements would be affected by Saxon phraseology, it is more than likely that

in the clash of two related ideas, the terms of like sound would meet, victory remaining with the term of the official side. For it must be noticed, also, that each of these three interpretations makes sense in the passage at the head, translating by either 'beacons' or 'sewers' or 'ditches,' and all (the first two especially) being possible "devant le port." In fact, in "le lieu Paradys, bien près les fosses de mesmes la ville," may we not find a reference of definition to the *beekenes* of the previous clause, which would go towards meaning three?

In the lack of positive proof, the point has interested me. Perhaps further light may be shed upon it by calling attention to it, though, to my own mind, at least, one proof seems present in what I have indicated under one.

A. GUYOT CAMERON.

Yale University.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Dr. Sauveur has always maintained that living languages can be treated as vital things, communicated and received as living agents, instead of being handled like dried specimens that represent a life foreign to our age. The latest edition of 'La Parole Française'* shows a growth that must add to the utility of the book. Following the plan adopted in the 'Petites Causeries' and the 'Causeries avec mes Elèves,' the author has expanded the brief exercises connected with each chapter into a series of interesting and carefully graded familiar talks, based on the successive chapters for translation into French. To these are added a clever verb-drill on the leading irregular verbs, the two interesting *contes* of Perrault, "Cendrillon" and "La Petit Poncet," a table of comparative French and English sounds, and a vocabulary, the two latter additions being the work of Professor Samuel Garner, of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

There is so skilful a balancing of the two languages here, such an adjustment of the

**La Parole Française*, Suivie de Devoirs et Traductions pour les Classes, Par L. Sauveur. New York: F. W. Christern. 1892, 12mo, pp. 195.

receptive and the productive in interesting and varied conversation, and so harmonious a blending of grammar and every-day language, that the book is sure to accomplish its object. It stands midway between the two other books already cited, and is adapted especially for use in large classes where the aim is to master quickly a large amount of available, every-day language, spoken and written, and to acquire facility in rapid reading.

SUSAN C. LOUGEE.

Roxbury High School (Boston.)

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—To a class commencing French and using 'Petites Causeries' one always teaches certain principles of French Grammar, but what has hitherto been accomplished with difficulty and at a great expense of time and strength, can now be satisfactorily achieved by using the 'Premières Leçons'* in connection with 'Petites Causeries.' The plan of this little book seems to me admirable; one accustomed to use the 'Natural Method' will find here not only an efficient guide, but a practical support. The table of English words given to represent the elementary French sounds is well adapted to its purpose; the affirmative, negative and interrogative forms of the verb are introduced in a way to help a scholar without confusing him; he is led into a knowledge of the four conjunctions so gradually that the well-arranged table of irregular verbs has no terrors for him. The bit of French at the beginning of each lesson, from which so much grammar is developed, may be also used for dictation, for memorizing and always for conversation.

ANNIE T. SMITH.

High School, Burlington, Vt.

BRIEF MENTION.

A valuable addition has been made by Macmillan & Co. (London, New York) to the general stock of books for the use of practical teachers, in 'French Dialogues, A Systematic Introduction to the Grammar and Idiom of Spoken French' by Johan Storm, Professor of Romance Philology in the University of

**Premières Leçons de Grammaire*, Par Marie-Louise Sauveur et Susan C. Lougee. New York: F. W. Christern, 1892. 12mo, pp. 118.

Christiania. Intermediate course: Authorised English Edition by Geo. Macdonald of Balliol College, Oxford. The French and English texts are arranged in parallel columns on the same page, the English equivalent being given on the right. Many American instructors of French are familiar with this work as adapted to some European language outside of English; the original Norwegian edition (also the second edition in this language), together with the Danish and Swedish, was published in 1887; the German and the Dutch followed in 1888; the second Danish and the Finnish in 1889; the second Swedish and Dutch, in 1891 and 1892 respectively. We are told in the English editor's preface that "the French text and the footnotes include the author's latest additions and improvements." This text represents the combined judgment of practical teachers, native French and Norse, among the former of whom the name of Paul Passy is conspicuous, who revised the proofs and made useful suggestions; and the belief is expressed that every precaution has been taken to make the work as correct and idiomatic as possible. The English part, too, is the result of consultation with Fellows of Balliol and Merton Colleges, with a native French and an English teacher of French.—The author gives the purpose of his work in the following words:

"My book is not meant for mere beginners . . . It is . . . intended in the first instance for advanced pupils, in Norway for boys at the gymnasium, young students and the general public. . . . The great majority of the dialogues have been composed by myself. The material has been accumulated during a lengthened period, partly by direct observation and partly from literature, especially plays."

Holding these points in view, the treatise is to be especially recommended for its sound method and the abundance and variety of material presented. (8vo, 218 pp. Price \$1.10.)

D. C. Heath & Co. have added to their *Modern Language Series* a new set of 'Exercises in French Composition.' These are due to Augusta C. Kimball and are based on Daudet's story 'la Belle Nivernaise.' They are intended for pupils in their third or fourth year of study and, consequently, present more difficulties than those which have appeared previously in this series. 24 pp., 12 cts.

PERSONAL.

George Maritz Wahl has been appointed Assistant Professor of Modern Languages in Williams College (Williamstown, Mass.). Mr. Wahl's early training was received in Germany, where he attended the Gymnasium of Arnstadt and the Universities of Leipsic and Halle. In 1881 he received the degree of M. A. from Rutgers College (New Brunswick, N. J.), and in 1891 that of L. H. D. from the same institution. From 1873-79 he was engaged in teaching in a preparatory school of New Brunswick (N. J.), and from 1879-92 was master of Modern Languages in Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass. Prof. Wahl has prepared a revision of 'Otto's Elementary German Grammar,' and written the following articles: "The German Gymnasium in its working order" (*Atlantic Monthly*, 1889); "The German Boy at Leisure" (*ibid.*, 1889); "Fürst Bismark" (*Harper's Magazine*, 1890).

Dr. Daniel Kilham Dodge (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vols. i, p. 128 and iv, p. 227) has been appointed to the Chair of the English Language and Literature at the University of Illinois (Champaign).

Dr. Henry R. Lang (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, pp. 127, 191) has been appointed Assistant Professor of Romance Languages in Yale University (New Haven, Conn.).

Dr. Hugo A. Rennert has been appointed Assistant Professor of Romance Languages at the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), where he received the B. A. degree. He had been some time Instructor in French and German in his Alma Mater, when, at the close of 1890-91 he was granted leave of absence for a year's study in Europe, and he availed himself of this favorable opportunity to take the doctor's degree at the University of Freiburg in Baden. For this degree he presented a thesis entitled: "The Spanish Pastoral Romances," (cf. *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association*, Vol. vii, No. 3).

E. L. Richardson has been appointed Instructor in Romance Languages at Vanderbilt University (Nashville, Tenn.). Mr. Richardson was graduated at Indiana University in 1891, and spent the last academic year (1891-92) at Leland Stanford Junior University, where he received the A. M. degree. He has written "Further Notes to Gaston Paris' 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland'" (MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. vii, pp. 156-157).

Edward E. Hale, Jr. (Ph. D., Halle, 1892) is now Professor of English at the State University of Iowa. Mr. Hale's chief work in Germany was linguistic in character under Sievers and Brandl. His dissertation, how-

ever, was upon a literary subject, "Die Chronologische Anordnung der Dichtungen Robert Herrick's." Halle, 1892.

OBITUARY.

THEODOR WISÉN.

On the fifteenth of February of this year, Theodor Wisén, Professor of Old Norse at the University of Lund, Sweden, died after a short illness. Wisén was born in the parish of Vissefjärda, Sweden, March 31st, 1835. After devoting himself, with marked success, to the study of the classics, especially Greek, he suddenly turned his attention to the subject that was destined to become his life work, and in 1865 he was appointed to the professorship that he held at the time of his death. He is said by those who had the privilege of listening to him, to have had a remarkable faculty for kindling enthusiasm in his auditors, and both in the class room and in the seminary established by him, he was always sure of attracting a goodly number of the students of Lund University.

As an author, Wisén is perhaps best known by his edition of the 'Homiliu-bok,' (Lund, 1872) for which he received, two years later, the prize of the Swedish Royal Academy. In 1881, he published through the *Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Literatur*, a collection of Icelandic rhymed poems under the title of 'Riddara-rimur,' the able introduction to which is of special value. Five years later, appeared a more extensive work on Icelandic poetry entitled 'Carmina Norræna,' containing text, commentary and a study of the metres, followed in 1889 by a glossary. Besides these three works, Wisén published a number of monographs, for the most part on Icelandic poetry, in various philological journals.

Wisén did not confine himself to his specialty. In 1889 he assisted in the publication of the second edition of the 'Ordlista' of the Academy. Some years before this he took an active part in the movement to continue the publication of the great dictionary of the Academy, being appointed the editor in chief. The actual editorship he transferred to K. F. Söderwall, retaining, however, a general supervision of the work. A specimen sheet of the dictionary was issued last winter, but to judge from the magnitude of the plan the first volume will probably not appear for some years. While Wisén's influence has been most deeply felt in his native land, his death is regretted by all lovers of the noble northern tongue in which he wrought so well.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCHE PHILOGIE. VOL. XXIV, NO. 1.—**Sljmons, B.**, Siegfried und Brunhild.—**Seeber, J.**, Über die 'neutralen Engel' bei Wolfram von Eschenbach und bei Dante.—**Koestlin, J.**, Beiträge aus Luther's Schriften zum Deutschen Wörterbuche.—**Zingerle, J. v.**, Predigtliteratur des 17. Jhs I.—**Golther, W.**, Konrad Hofmann.—**Minor, J.**, Ein Brief Schillers.—**No. 2.**—**Sliebs, Th.**, Beiträge zur deutschen Mythologie. I. Der Todesgott, ahd. Henno Wotan—Mercurius.—**Pappenheim, M.**, Zum *ganga undir jartarmen*.—**Jeitteles und Lewy**, Zum Spruch von den zehn Altersstufen des Menschen.—**Streicher, O.**, Zur Entwicklung der mhd. Lyrik.—**Kawerau, G.**, Neue Belege für den Gebrauch von *thäte*=mhd. *entete* bei Luther.—**Krause, G.**, Ein Brief Gottscheds an den Königsberger Professor Flottwell.—**Borinski, K.**, Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutsch-romanischen Sektion der 41. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner zu München.—**No. 3.**—**Jaekel, H.**, Die Hauptgöttin der Istvaeen.—**Kluge, H.**, Aar und Adler.—**Erdmann, O.**, Zu den kleineren ahd. denkmälern.—**Tingerle, I.**, Predigtliteratur des. 17. Jhs. II.—**Powel, J.**, Ungedruckte Briefe Herders und seiner Gattin an Gleim.—**Jellinghaus, H.**, Bericht über die 16. Jahresversammlung des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung in Lüneburg am 19. und 20. Mai 1891.

ARKIV FÖR NORDISK FILOLOGI. NEW SERIES. VOL. IV. PART 2.—**Bacr, R. C.**, Über die Qrvar-Odds saga.—**Noreen, Adolf**, Bidrag til den fornordiska slutartickelns historia.—**Morgenstern, Gustav**, Zur überlieferung der grossen ölafssaga Tryggvasonar.—**Beckman, Natanael**, Om *y*-typen som tecken för ändelsevokaler i Sælinna Träst. Ett bidrag till fornsvenskans långa ändelsevokaler.—**Noreen, Ad.**, Bidrag till äldre Västgötalagens tåktstkritik. II.—**Unger, R. C.**, Bemerkninger om nogle islandske og norske Haandskrifter fra Middelalderen.—**Wisen, Theodor**, Anmælan av "Andreas Heusler, Der Ljópaháttir. Eine metrische Untersuchung."—**Cederschloeld, Gustaf**, Anmælan av "Håndskriftet Nr. 23654: to (Codex Regius af den ældre Edda). Udg. ved Ludv. F. A. Wimmer og Finnur Jónsson."—**Lund, Otto**, Nekrolog över G. F. V. Lund.

Idem. VOL. IV. PART 3.—**Porkelsson, Jón**, Islandske håndskrifter i England og Skotland.—**Magnússon, Elfríkr**, Kodex Skardensis af postulasögur.—**Boer, R. C.**, Weiteres zur Qrvar-Odds saga.—**Kock, Axel**, Sprachhistoriska bidrag I-III.—**Lind, E. H.**, Bibliografi för år 1890.—**Better, Ferdinand**, Anmælan av "Die Eddische Kosmogonie, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kosmogonie des Altertums und des Mittelalters von Dr. Elard Hugo Meyen."

Idem. VOL. IV. PART 4. **Jónsson, Finnur**, Navnet *Ljópaháttir* og andre versarter navne, samt rettelser i texten i Codex regius af Snorres Edda.—**Eggert, Ó. Brun**, Athuganir og leiðréttingar við Stutrlunga sögu.—**Olrik, Axel**, Er Uffesagnet indvandret fra England?—**Cederschloeld, Gustaf**, Nekrolog över Theodor Wisen.—**Morgenstern, Gustav**, Notizen.—**Kock, Axel**, Anmælan av "Robert Larsson, Södermannalagens språk I. Ljudlära."

Idem. VOL. V, PART I. **Jónsson, Finnur**, Mytiske forestillinger i de ældste skjaldekvad.—**Cederschloeld, G.**, Har Qrvar Odds saga lånat från Magus saga?—**Geete, Robert**, En svensk Trojassaga från 1529.—**Koch, Axel**, Behandlingen av fornsvenskt kort *y*-ljud och supradentalers invärkan på vokalisationen.—**Kålund, Kr.**, Kulturhistorisk-lexikolske småting.—**Beckman, Nat.**, Till vokalbalansen a: å (o) i fornsvenskans sydligare dialekter.—**Cederschloeld, Gustaf**, Am komparationen af fornisländska adjektiv på *-legr* (*ligr*) och adverb på *-lega* (*-līga*).—**Dahlerup, Verner**, Anmælan av "Ludvig Larsson; Ordförordet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna leksikaliskt och grammatiskt ordnat."

DANIA, TIDSSKRIFT FOR FOLKEMÅL OG FOLKEMINDER. VOL. I, PART 4.—**Olrik, Axel**, Dansk folkmindelitteratur 1891.—**Jespersen, Otto**, Sproglige Kuriosa.—**Nielsen, Anton**, Småtræk af livet i ældre tider.—**Nyrop, Kr.**, Skomageren og kalven.—**Olrik, Axel**, Nyere tysk litteratur om Sigurd af Brynhild.—**Jespersen, Otto**, En prisopgave.—**Kruger, J. K.**, Sællandske sprogsprøver.—Småting og Forespørgsler.—Endnu engang "fore" (Jsp.).—**Pottjansch (Kr. N.)**, Hovmanden og præsten (V. Blerring).—Bide til bollen (Kr. N.).—Hestesko (E. Rørdam).—Kludetæret (Kr. N.).—Anmeldelser. Aarbog for dansk kulturhistorie (J. Ottasen).—Feilberg. Levende begravet (A.O.).—Am Tr-Ouell iii.—Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde.—Vodskov, Dr. E. Jessens formædelige Skandale (E. Rørdam).—V. Bennike, Nordfriserne og deres land (J. O.).

ROMANIA, No. 82, AVRIL, 1892. TOME XXI.—**Raynaud, G.**, La Chastelaine de Vergi.—**Neuhauer, A. et Meyer, P.**, Le Roman provençal d'Esther.—**Toynbee, P.**, Christine de Pisan and Sir John Maundeville.—**Weigand, G.**, Nouvelles recherches sur le roumain de l'Istrie.—**Milot, L.**, Valbeton dans *Givart de Roussillon*.—**Paris, G.**, Le chansen à boire anglo-normande parodie du *Letabundus*.—**Paris, G.**, La traduction de la légende latine du voyage de Charlemagne à Constantinople, par Pierre de Beauvais.—**Longnon, A.**, Nouvelles recherches sur Villon.—**Thomas, A.**, Jean Castel.—**P., G.**, W. Foerster, *Romanische Bibliothek*.—**P., G.**, G. Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls des Grossen*.—**P., G.**, *Karel ende Elegast*, uitgegeven door E. T. Kuiper.—**M., P.**, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres Bibliothèques*, t. xxxiv, première partie.—**M., P.**, E. Foresti, *P. de Lunel, dit Cavalier Lunel de Montech*, troubadour du xiv. siècle.—**Luce, S.**, *Le Vian-kier de Taillevent*, p. p. Pichon et Vicaire.

REVUE DES LANGUES ROMANES, Oct.-Nov.-Déc., 1891.—**Novati, G.**, Nouvelles recherches sur le roman de Florimont.—**Pellissier, Les Amis d'Holstenius**.—**Revillout, La Légende de Boileau.—**Lagarenne, P.**, Quatre fables de Lafontaine en saintongéais.—**Blanc, A.**, Le groupe *et* de *Sanctus*.—**Constans, L.**, A propos d'un compte rendu du *Roman de Thèbes*.—**Pellissier**, Manuscrits provençaux de Marseille.—**Pellissier**, Épitaphe anacyclique de Richelieu.—**Bibliographie**, Marchot, Cours de grammaire historique, par Darmesteter.—**Pellissier**, Le Midi littéraire, par A. Roque-Frér.**

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, December, 1892.

LA TRADITION D'EGINHARD ET EMMA dans la poésie romanesca de la péninsule Hispanique.*

INTRODUCTION :

*Altérations pour la forme et le fond que la
légende carolingienne a subies en
Espagne.*

S'IL est bien constant que sur le sol espagnol il vit toujours dans la bouche du peuple une longue série de romances et de chansons célé-

*Table des livres cités dans cet article sans indications suffisantes :

AZEVEDO, ALVARO RODRIGUES DE, Romanceiro do Archipelago da Madeira, Funchal, 1880.

BRAGA, THEOPHILO, Cancioneiro e Romanceiro geral portuguez, 5 volumes : Vol. iii : Romanceiro geral, Coimbra, 1867. Vol. iv : Cantos populares do Archipelago Açoriano, Porto, 1869.

—, O Povo portuguez nos seus costumes, crenças e tradições, 2 volumes, Lisboa, 1885.

CALDERÓN, SERAFÍN ESTÉBANEZ, Escenas andaluzas, Madrid, 1883.

DURÁN, D. AGUSTIN, Romancero General, 2 vols., Madrid, 1859, (2ème édition).

GAYANGOS, D. PASCUAL DE, Libros de caballerias, con un . . . catálogo razonado, Madrid, 1857.

GARRETT (João Baptista, visconde de Almeida-Garrett), Romanceiro, t. i, Lisb. 1843; ii et iii 1851.

HARDUNG, VICTOR EUGENIO, Romanceiro portuguez, 2 tomos : Leipzig, 1877.

MILÁ Y FONTANALS, DR. D. MANUEL, De la poesía heroico-popular castellana. Barcelona, 1874.

—, Observaciones sobre la poesía popular, con muestras de romances catalanes inéditos. Barcelona, 1853.

—, Romancerillo catalán : canciones tradicionales, 2da edición refundida y aumentada. Barcelona, 1882.

MUNTKE, ÅKE W : son, Folkpoesi från Asturien. Upsal, 1888.

PARIS, G., Histoire poétique de Charlemagne. Paris, 1865.

PIDAL, MENENDEZ, Colección de los RR. viejos que se cantan por los Asturianos . . . Madrid, 1885.

REIS DAMASO, Tradições populares do Algarve, dans la *Encyclopedia Republicana*. Lisb., 1882.

TICKNOR, G., History of Spanish Literature. 3 vols., New York, 1854.

WOLF, FERDINAND, Studien zur Geschichte der sp. und pg. Nationalliteratur. Berlin, 1859.

WOLF Y HOFMANN, Primavera y flor de RR. Berlin, 1856.

brant Charlemagne et ses paladins, les documents historiques sur la première apparition de ces poésies dans la péninsule nous font cependant défaut. Il paraît certain que peu de temps après l'invasion franque la tradition péninsulaire s'est emparée de Maynete et du pas de Roncesvalles. Mais les savants tels que M. G. Paris et Milá y Fontanals tombent d'accord que cette plus ancienne forme de la légende carolingienne en Espagne a disparu sans laisser de traces visibles—*que se había perdido ó poco menos*¹ et que les romances survivant jusqu'aujourd'hui sont dues à une irruption postérieure de contes français, soit du onzième ou du douzième siècle.²

Milá y Fontanals invoque l'exemple des librettistes pour illustrer la façon dont les *juglares* d'Espagne procédèrent pour acclimater dans leur patrie la matière de France. Avec la licence accordée à ceux-là, ils résumèrent en de courtes rhapsodies les contes épiques qui avaient cours chez leurs confrères du nord ou qu'ils trouvaient écrits dans les chroniques venant de la France. Car généralement les originaux français n'auront pas revêtu la forme de *cantos cortos y populares*, et l'on sait les raisons³ pour lesquelles les Espagnols n'ont point développé ni adopté les "épopées de longue haleine."⁴

Rien de plus curieux que de poursuivre les modifications auxquelles, pour le fond aussi, la légende carolingienne a dû se soumettre dans ce procès d' "hispanisation," c'est-à-dire, pour se populariser dans les royaumes de l'Espagne médiévale. Nous pouvons regarder comme le type personnifié de ces transformations le fameux héros Bernardo del Carpio. N'étant autre, à l'origine historique, que le petit-fils de Charlemagne et roi d'Italie, il se métamorphose peu à peu—grâce au patriotisme rétrospectif des *juglares*—en neveu d'Alphonse le Chaste, vainqueur de Roland lui-même et représentant de l'esprit national de

1 Milá y Fontanals, 'Poesía heroico-popular,' p. 375.

2 G. Paris, 'Hist. poét.,' pp. 203, 204.

3 Wolf, 'Studien,' p. 409.

4 Même le noble berger Eugenio, D. Q., I. 51, ne cache pas l'aversion qu'il a pour les romances de *legua y media de escritura* !

la patrie soulevé contre les envahisseurs étrangers. Tel est le personnage que les romances ont consacré; tel nous le retrouvons dans les dernières continuations qu'ait eues la tradition carolingienne, comme dans celle de Moreira et de Gomes parue en Portugal au siècle dernier.⁵

Ainsi ce n'est donc pas seulement en Castellan que les contes carolingiens, en se frayant une voie au delà des Pyrénées ont été imités, mais nous en trouvons aussi dans le pays de langue Catalane et en Portugal. Milá y Fontanals, faisant remarquer⁶ qu'il n'existe guère en catalan de romances relatives à l'histoire de la Catalogne elle-même, cherche à prouver qu'aussi les romances carolingiennes n'y ont pas passé directement du français, mais seulement par l'intermédiaire des poésies juglaresques castillanes. Du moins, s'il y a eu à une époque reculée une communication immédiate de contes épiques français, ils ne se sont conservés qu'une vie éphémère et l'on ne saurait y ramener les *cantigas carolingias* que le peuple catalan chante de nos jours. Il me paraît probable qu'une théorie analogue de la médiation castillane soit à admettre pour les romances de ce cycle qui subsistent en Portugal.⁷

CHAPITRE I.

La tradition d'Eginhard se fixant en Espagne.

Passons, dans le vaste cycle carolingien, à la légende particulière sur laquelle roulera le

5 Je dois à la complaisance de Mme. de Vasconcellos, à Porto, d'être en possession d'un exemplaire de cette rareté carolingienne, sur laquelle M. G. Paris a puisé ses renseignements dans les quelques remarques données par Gayangos, 'Catilogo razonado,' p. lxiv, mais qui, sur la foi de M. Braga, *'ainda hoje o [livro] mais lido e reproduzido em Portugal.* La réimpression est de Lisbonne, 1888; v. au verso du frontispice de la 1.ère partie.—Les deux premières parties, par Jeronymo Moreira, parurent en 1728 et 1737, selon Innocencio; elles résument le contenu des trois livres publiés sur la même matière par Nicoláo Piamonte (Séville, 1525), et traduits à leur tour d'un original français, "Conquêtes du grand Charlemagne," paru quarante ans auparavant. En 1745, Gaetano Gomes donna sa *Verdadeira terceira parte* qui commence par la création *ab ovo* et constitue un simple fatras fantastique. L'auteur, notons-le en passant, ne paraît avoir mis que douze jours (du 27 juin au 8 juillet) à écrire ce volume, cf. iii, p. 10, 3e ligne d'un bas, et la date au bas de la p. 5.—Comparez G. Ticknor, i, 244 et -ii, 479, 480 (pour l'édition espagnole), et surtout Braga, 'O Povo portuguez,' vol. ii, p. 473-476.

6 'Observaciones sobre la poesia popular,' p. 95.

présent essai: celle d'Eginhard et Emma. L'une des plus gracieuses dans le nombre sans doute, bien qu'elle ne traite que d'un événement tout à fait épisodique dans l'histoire poétique de Charlemagne.

On sait qu'un passage du 'Chronicon Laurehamense,'⁸ couché sur le parchemin le 27 octobre. 1095, par ordre du révérend père Anselmus,⁹ est la source¹⁰ de cette tradition—car c'en est bien une, malgré les Grasse, les Ideler, les Teulet¹¹ et les autres apologistes de l'authenticité du fait.¹² L'Eginhard historique, homme d'état et secrétaire de Charlemagne, n'aura guère séduit les princesses franques. Les doctes courtisans se moquaient de lui—*iocularibus nominibus: nardulus, parvulus, . . . homullo*¹³—et Walahfrid lui-même, dans son prologue à la 'Vita Caroli' d'Eginhard,¹⁴ l'appelle: "homuncio—nam statura despicabilis videbatur." Il épousa "Immam, sororem Bernharii . . . qui . . . ecclesiae Wormatiensi episcopus . . . praefuit."¹⁵ Seulement sur la fin du onzième siècle

in cænobio Laurehamensi, quem quidem locum Einhartus donatione sibi devinxerat, fabulose narrabant, Immam ipsius Caroli fuisse filiam, Einhartoque post amatorios casus, patre tandem concedente, nupsisse.¹⁶

Cette aventure érotique a d'ailleurs été attribuée par Guillaume de Malmesbury au secrétaire et à la sœur de l'Empereur d'Allemagne, Henri V.¹⁷ et rapportée par Vincent de Beauvais à l'époque de Henri III.¹⁸ Les poètes modernes l'ont souvent chantée; mais

7 V. aussi, pp. 14, 15.

8 Du cloître de Lorsch, entre Darmestat et Manheim.

9 Voir dans les 'Monumenta Germaniae, Scriptores,' t. xxi, p. 428 et p. 358, 359.

10 Car il n'est pas probable que ce passage reproduise une légende alors déjà divulguée; il ne reflète plutôt que les propos des moines arrangés dans le but de glorifier les origines de leur couvent.

11 V. G. Paris, 'Hist. poét.,' p. 405, note 1.

12 Même Milá y Fontanals et M. Pidal ne paraissent pas s'être défaits de cette erreur. Milá y Fontanals, en parlant de Charlemagne, ajoute entre parenthèses: "que en efecto se cree generalmente haber sido suegro de su historiógrafo" ('Poesía heroica,' i, p. 356). Pour M. Pidal, v. note 23.

13 Cf. Phil. Jaffé, *Bibl. rerum germanicarum*, t. iv. ('Monumenta Carolina'), p. 497. 14 *Ib.*, p. 508.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 492. 16 *Ibidem*.

17 G. Paris, 'Hist. poét.,' p. 405.

18 Th. Braga, 'C. e R. geral,' iii, 167.

on ne la trouve pas dans les chansons populaires françaises. En revanche, les peuples de l'Espagne en ont largement conservé le souvenir.

Ceci établi, la question est de savoir par quel chemin elle a pu pénétrer jusque chez eux. Almeida-Garrett¹⁹ émet brièvement l'opinion que la romance d'Eginaldo "é de origem visivelmente franceza, se provençal ou normanda não me atrevo a decidir," donc point encore de jugement arrêté. M. Braga²⁰ est plus sûr de son fait :

"Este assumpto"—généralement parlant d'une dame qui se fait aimer de son vassal—"era a predilecção dos menestres populares; representa a acção que... exerceu a *poesia provençal*, isto é—a fusão do elemento aristocrático e feudal com o povo, pelo sentimento... (p. 170.) O romance de Gerineldo encontra-se em Hespanha e Portugal, justamente até onde se estendeu a *acção da poesia provençal*; o genio hespanhol, impulsionado pelo sentimento cavalheiresco da honra, e o caracter portuguez, dominado pela integridade do dever, acceitam esta *creação dos trovadores da Provença*, em que a dama do solar, a filha do hidalgo se deixa amar por um homem de condição inferior... (p. 171) é *incontestavelmente de origem provençal*."

Il est vrai que plusieurs traits dans ces romances paraissent accuser l'esprit provençal et que dans la poésie occitanienne raffinée on trouve souvent traités des sujets analogues :—au seuil même de la production des troubadours un fameux poème²¹ de Guillaume VII de Poitou débite la morale lascive qu'une dame qu'on exclut de la bonne denrée est en droit de descendre à des gens de bas étage.²² Je dois cependant m'opposer à la thèse que M. Braga énonce dans les passages cités des pages 170, 171, où il vient insensiblement à faire passer la romance d'Eginhard, pour une création réelle des troubadours provençaux. Si vraiment, ce qui est improuvable, ceux-ci s'en sont emparés à une époque quelconque, ils n'ont certainement fait que mettre en vers une légende alors déjà répandue et dont l'in-

vention revient uniquement aux moines de Lorsch.²³

Il ne paraît donc pas compatible avec une critique sobre de regarder la médiation des troubadours provençaux comme un fait acquis. Aussi M. G. Paris a-t-il préféré n'en pas faire mention: "Le nom de Gerineldo (Eginhard)," dit-il,²⁴ "tout à fait inconnu à nos traditions, prouve qu'elles (i. e. les romances espagnoles) ont puisé dans les *chroniques*, comme cela leur est d'ailleurs arrivé plus d'une fois." Donc point d'assertion gratuite! Seulement pas l'ombre d'une hypothèse sur la nature de ces chroniques: si c'était le 'Chronicon Laureshamense' lui-même qu'un hasard aurait fait connaître à des lettrés espagnols, ou bien une chronique de France venant à tomber entre leurs mains par l'intermédiaire des jongleurs du Midi? Sa réticence s'explique de la façon du monde la plus simple: tout indice positif fait défaut; c'est nuit close.

M. Braga voudrait revendiquer, sinon une origine distincte, du moins une voie d'importation particulière aux versions portugaises de la légende d'Eginhard: "não nos veio através

²³ Les dernières paroles font voir que la solution du problème proposée par M. Pidal ne me sourit pas non plus—solution qui, sans avoir expressément recours aux troubadours provençaux, se rapproche beaucoup de celle donnée par M. Braga. Je transcris le passage respectif de Pidal ('Colección...', p. 283):

"El tipo del osado paje que á hurtadillas y mafiosamente corteja á una dama principal, mercediendo sus favores, es un carácter muy corriente en todos los siglos y literaturas, y sobre todo en los de la Media Edad; es la expresión simbólica de que el amor no reconoce clases. Por tanto nos inclinamos á creer que antes de *cantar los amoris de Eginardo, cantó el romance los de cualquier mancebo de humilde condición que galanteaba á la castellana su señora, ó á una doncella de alto rango; haciendo por tal manera la apoteosis del amor que iguala linajes, idea acariciada con dulce halago por la mente de los de un trovador andariego.*

Las especiales condiciones en que Eginardo se encontraba, las circunstancias de sus amores, y el ser éstos con la hija del hombre más importante de su época, hicieron que en la persona de Eginardo se concretara el tipo del *atrevido pantiagudo*, aunque aparezca velado su verdadero nombre con los de *Gerineldo, Reginaldo y Eginaldo*..., que no difieren tanto de aquél; y él de Emma con él de *Enilda*, también bastante parecido."

Je préférerais à cette argumentation celle que voici: Du temps où florissait la poésie juglaresque, les esprits étaient en effet prédisposés pour de pareils sujets—preuve la coexistence de nombreuses romances vieilles sur des matières analogues. C'est pourquoi, une fois propagée en Espagne—nous verrons par quelle voie—la légende d'Eginhard fut avidement recueillie et exploitée par les *juglares*. M. Pidal a donc tort de croire que seulement le nom d'Eginaldo ait alors été introduit dans une romance déjà en circulation.

²⁴ 'Hist. poét.', p. 405.

¹⁹ En 1843, dans son 'Romanceiro,' i, p. xvi.

²⁰ 'C. e R. geral,' iii, p. 169 et suiv.

²¹ "Compaigno, non posc mudar que no m'esfrei"... cf. P. Meyer, 'Recueil d'anciens textes,' i, 69, No. 7, et K. Bartsch, 'Chrest. provençale,' Cols. 31, 32.

²² Cf.: "Chascus beuri ans de l'aiga qe's laisses morir de sei."

da Hespanha, como a maior parte dos romances carolinos."²⁵ En soi, cela ne serait pas impossible; on n'aurait qu'à penser à la dynastie bourguignonne établie au Portugal et à ses rapports continuels avec le Midi de la France. La raison alléguée ne m'a pourtant pas convaincu; la différence de fond d'avec les romances castillanes n'est pas assez marquée pour donner prise à une pareille supposition. On sait même que Garrett²⁶ réclamait encore exclusivement pour le Portugal cette belle romancé—point sur lequel nous sommes cependant mieux instruits à l'heure qu'il est.

La poésie artistique et le théâtre espagnols ne paraissent pas avoir mis à profit la tradition d'Eginhard; au moins je n'en ai trouvé aucun indice.²⁷ De même il ne fut trouvé dans la Péninsule aucune rédaction en prose de cette légende. Ce n'est qu'au dix-huitième siècle que le Père João Baptista de Castro la raconta dans sa 'Hora de recreyo nas ferias de mayores estudos e oppressão de mayores cuidados,' p. 35, Centuria iii, No. 61. Cf. Braga, 'C. e R. geral,' iv, 423.

Les poésies populaires sur Eginhard et Emma se divisent, naturellement, en chansons et en romances. La somme des chansons et romances (imprimées) de cette famille et des familles congénères atteint au nombre remarquable de deux cents environ: Mme. de Vasconsellos évalue celui des chansons à une centaine et compte à peu près autant de romances sûr ce sujet et sur des matières analogues. L'extension de leur domaine embrasse toute la péninsule hispanique, avec le Roussignol catalan, les îles Baléares, la colonie catalane d'Alghero en Sardaigne,²⁸ les Açores, le groupe de Madère et les Canaries; en outre les Indes anciennement espagnoles et portugaises, par lesquelles il faut comprendre surtout l'Amérique latine, enfin la population mauro-hispanique de l'Afrique barbaresque.

²⁵ 'C. e R. geral,' iii, 167.

²⁶ Voir son 'Romanceiro,' ii, p. 156.

²⁷ Pour d'autres contes carolingiens, qui ont fourni le sujet d'œuvres dramatiques, v. G. Paris, 'Hist. poét.,' pp. 208, 211, 212, 215; Ticknor i, p. 127, note, et Pidal, 'Colección. . .,' p. 17.

²⁸ Milá y Fontanals 'Poes. her.,' note 2: la població catalana de Alguer en la Isla de Cerdeña.

Dans la présente étude, nous mettons à part dès l'abord les *canciones*; restent donc à commenter les romances seules. Encore me bornerai-je pour le moment à parler de celles qui ont conservé le nom du héros (dans une forme hispanisée) et que l'on peut, pour cette raison, désigner comme le cycle de Gerineldo proprement dit. Avant de donner le résumé du développement que la tradition a suivi à travers toute la série de ces romances, je les vais passer en revue en les groupant d'après leurs idiomes respectifs. Je tâcherai de donner une appréciation de chaque texte, et j'ajouterai les remarques indispensables sur les particularités du récit.

CHAPITRE II.

Revue des romances de Gerineldo.²⁹

Souvenez-vous de Marguerite
Et du poëte Alain Chartier;
Il était bien laid, dit l'histoire,
La dame était fille de roi.

A. DE MUSSET, 'Poés. Nouv.'

De Venus es su jugare.

Vieille romance de MELISENDA.

A. Voici les romances castillanes sur Eginhard et Emma.

1. Gerineldos, Gerineldos,
mi camarero pulido.

Vers 1-2.

Romance de trente-trois couples de vers, fort répandue en Andalousie, recueillie à Triana, en 1882, et p.p. Calderón, 'Escenas and.,'

²⁹ Comme l'immense majorité, de toutes les romances, celles de Gerineldo sont rédigées en *versos de redondilla mayor* ou vers (trochaïques) octosyllabiques; elles assonnent toutes en *i-o*, les vers de nombre impair restant blancs et étant à volonté *llanos* ou *agudos*. Les passages qui n'assonnent point en *i-o* se font par cela même à reconnaître pour des retouchements maladroits (B1, 2, 6, 14, 16; 2, 6, 8, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 32; C2, 26, 5, 15-34, 7, 29-38 assonnent en *i-a*, A9, 6 et C7, 17-28 en *-i*, B2, 24 en *i-e*)—ou pour des interpolations, resp. pour des fragments qui originellement n'ont pas fait corps avec la romance (dans A9, six vers assonnant en *-e* et six en *-i* précèdent l'introduction légitime; les vers 69-72 assonnent en *i-a*; A9, 73-134, A8, 73-126, C1, 105-168, 4, 65-76, F, 51-76 en *-i*; C5, 67-70, 6, 67-70 en *-e*); pour les irrégularités très saillantes dans C8 et 9, voir note 52.

NB. Si l'assertion de Wolf, 'Studien,' p. 441, est en général juste, il a tort en tout cas de compter parmi ses preuves la romance de Reginaldo, qui est à supprimer dans l'énumération à la page 440.

pp. 256-258. Pour la correction de la forme et la transmission intacte du texte, cette version mérite d'être regardée comme une des plus légitimes (*genuinas, castizas*) de toutes.

La romance s'ouvre par un dialogue (vers 1-12) entre la belle Infante, sans nom dans cette version, et son gentil chambellan Gerineldos: elle voudrait bien l'avoir à son service la nuit, pendant trois heures. N'étant qu'humble serviteur, Gerineldos croit d'abord être le point de mire de la plaisanterie de sa maîtresse; celle-ci toutefois, mettant de côté les préventions de sa condition élevée, s'obstine à lui répéter sa requête, et l'on convient de se voir entre une et deux heures, "lorsque le Roi sera endormi." À l'heure fixée, Gerineldos ouvre secrètement la coulisse (*rastrillo*), met des sandales de soie pour ne pas faire de bruit, et fait plusieurs fois le tour du château, évidemment pour épier le moment favorable (13-18). Dès qu'il s'est fait connaître comme "Gerineldos . . . , vuestro tan querido amigo," l'Infante lui tend la main et l'aide à monter à sa couche, où les amants s'assoupissent entre des baisers et des embrassements (19-28).—Sur cela, le Roi, anonyme aussi, se réveille d'un songe pénible. Ayant appelé trois fois en vain son *camarero pulido*, il crie à la trahison: "Ou tu es allé te coucher avec l'Infante, ou bien tu as vendu le château!" (29-38). Furieux, il saisit son épée et—découvre le serviteur infidèle dans le lit de sa fille. Il va percer le félon; mais une pensée touchante lui traverse la tête et le fait arrêter soudain: "Más crióle de chiquito," "Cependant je l'ai nourri tout petit"! (39-44). Il se contente de déposer l'épée nue entre les deux, en témoignage tacite de sa présence inaperçue (45-48).—L'Infante se réveille la première; transie de frayeur et fondant en sanglots, elle fait remarquer³⁰ à Gerineldos la découverte fatale (49-54). Lorsque celui-ci cherche à gagner sa chambre, le Roi, à l'improviste, sort à sa rencontre:

"D'où viens-tu, Gerineldos, si blême (*mustio*) et si décoloré"?

"Je viens, Seigneur, de cueillir des fleurs et des lis au jardin, et la rose la plus odorante a mangé mes couleurs."

³⁰ Au vers 52, au lieu de "Recordad heis, Gerineldos," il faut lire: "Recordaos, . . ."

"Tu mens, Gerineldos, car tu as dormi avec l'Infante. Mon épée en est témoin: son tranchant accomplira ta peine" (55-66).

2. Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
mi camarero es Pulfo. Vers 5-6.

Durán, 'Romo. Gral' i, p. 177; Wolf y Hofmann, 'Primavera y flor,' ii, p. 101 note: "Todavía en Andalucía, con el nombre de *Corrio ó Corrido ó Carrerilla*, que así llama la gente del campo á los romances que conserva por tradición, se recita ó cuenta el siguiente. . . ." À y regarder de près, ce n'est qu'un fragment de A1; ou, pour vrai dire, deux: les premiers huit couples de vers correspondants à l'introduction de A1, et, erronément préposés, deux couples de la scène finale, savoir le commencement du dialogue qui se passe au jardin entre le Roi et Gerineldo.³¹

3.
levantóse Gerineldo
que al Rey dexara dormido. 1, 2.

'R. Gral' i, No. 320; 'Prim.' (ii) No. 161: la dernière des sept pièces contenues dans le *pliego suello* de 1537 (sin L., 4 *fojas*, fig.), le 69e de la liste de Durán ('R. Gral' i, p. lxxiii).—Extrêmement populaire dans les Asturies.

Le contenu des vingt couples de vers qui subsistent se rapproche beaucoup, de celui du No. 1, vers 13-54. Il y manque le commencement, l'invitation adressée à Gerineldo par la Princesse, ainsi que la fin, le dénouement amené par l'intervention du Roi. Cet état de choses établi, on pourrait se sentir tenté de prendre les Nos. 2 et 3 pour des fragments d'une seule et même version. Voici cependant des raisons, hors leur diverse extraction locale, propres à renverser cette hypothèse. A2 présente un texte assez déperlé et des amplifications ineptes—circonstances qui, tout en laissant à ce fragment le caractère d'une véritable poésie populaire, marquent pourtant la détérioration qu'il a subie dans le cours des siècles. Dans aucune version, au contraire, la diction n'est aussi concise et vigoureuse que dans A3; encore est-ce celle qui a gardé le

³¹ Il faut donc lire au vers 3: "Vengo del jardín, Señor," et non "Señora," comme l'impriment Durán et Wolf. Pour Pulfo, voir, au chap. iii, l'alinéa 'Personnages.'

plus d'archaïsmes (de forme et de syntaxe³²); ces particularités répandent autour de la romance A3 un subtil parfum d'antiquité, dont encore A1, 6, 7, 8 ont sauvé une bonne partie, mais qui se perd de plus en plus dans les autres rédactions.

4. "Este es vn romance de Gerineldos, el paje del Rey, nueuamente compuesto":

Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
El mi paje mas querido.
1, 2.

'R. Gral' i, No. 321; Prim. (ii) No. 161a: d'après un *pliego suelto* souvent imprimé du seizième siècle (sin L. ni A., 2 *fojas*, fig.), le 85e de la liste de Durán (p. lxxiv). 59 couples de vers. Rédaction refaite et interpolée par un poète populaire de profession. Les vers 1-26 paraissent assez intacts, 27-94 et 99-108 un peu modernisés, mais toujours s'appuyant sur le texte primitif; les vers 95-98 forment une *cuadra* additionnelle, présentant des traits empruntés à une poésie étrangère, et v. 109-118 sont de libre invention, d'après des modèles célèbres.

À relever une petite incongruité: d'abord le jardin est fixé comme lieu de l'entrevue nocturne, tandis que, après coup, on se donne rendez-vous dans le boudoir d'Enildas, sans que rien n'ait préalablement fait entrevoir un changement de plan.—Le Roi, voulant s'habiller et ne trouvant pas ses vêtements, appelle en vain Gerineldo et saute du lit, craignant qu'un accident ne soit arrivé à son page (37-48). Ces appréhensions ne paraissent pourtant servir que de prétexte: car nous voyons le Monarque se diriger tout droit vers la chambre à coucher de son auguste fille, sans doute par simultanéité d'un autre pressentiment qui lui rappelle la faiblesse de toute chair. À l'aspect qui s'offre au Roi, il doute de ses yeux—j'en laisse la responsabilité au poète anonyme—et devient tout pensif. La douceur de son caractère ne tarde pas à se révolter contre un rigorisme outré: "Tuerai-je Gerineldo que j'ai aimé comme un fils"? Cependant la politique n'y manque pas:

32 Le vieil emploi syntaxique des formes dérivées du plusqpt. ind. latin se trouve aux vers A3, 2, 11, 27, 29, 31; c'est-à-dire, plus souvent que dans aucune des autres variantes.

¡Si yo matare la Infanta
Mi reino tengo perdido!
49-60.

De l'heureuse union de ces vues résulte l'expédient qu'on sait.—Le Roi se retire dans les ombres du jardin. Enilda, déconcertée, renvoie précipitamment Gerineldo de sa chambre, non toutefois sans le rassurer sur la persistance de ses bonnes grâces. Celui-ci, se faufilant dans les allées du jardin, y est arrêté par le Roi aux aguets, qui sait confondre tous ses subterfuges et lui jette à la face son inconduite (83-94). Dans ce moment, on remet au soudan (!) un grand pli, dont le contenu le fait pâlir; pour s'assurer, en attendant de la personne de Gerineldo, il ordonne de l'enfermer dans le château (95-100). Voilà que la belle Enilda, sans attendre le retour du "bon Roi en furie," se met à courir à la poursuite de son amant, qui évidemment a pris en temps utile, lui aussi, le parti de se sauver. Sautant lestement par-dessus l'échallier (*tapia*, A5: *verja*) qui entoure le jardin, elle le rejoint dans le parvis (*egido*) du palais: sur un fougueux coursier ils s'enfuient à tout jamais en Tatarie (101-112). Là, on se fait baptiser—pour le bon plaisir des prêtres du seizième siècle—, on se marie en toute forme et l'on a l'agréable perspective d'un avenir garanti par les joyaux 33 emportés dans deux caisses d'or fin (113-118).

5. "Canción 34 nueva del Gerineldo, en la que se expresan los amores y fuga de un oficial ruso con la bella Enilda, sultana favorita del Gran Señor":

Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
Gerineldito querido.
41, 42.

Pliego suelto du 19. siècle, Madrid, s. a., 72 couples de vers, divisés en dix-huit huitains.—

33 Au vers 115, les éditions de Durán et de Wolf portent un texte inintelligible. Il faut lire:

Y con las joyas que lleva . . .
le; on qu'exige aussi le rythme.

34 Ce n'en est pas moins une véritable *romance*, comme le prouve le mètre et l'assonance, qui reste la même d'un bout à l'autre. Il n'y a que la division extérieure en strophes qui, pour les yeux, lui prête l'air d'une *canci n*; on a choisi cette forme parce que, généralement, le peuple est bien plus habitué aujourd'hui à voir imprimer des chansons que des romances. Je fais observer en passant que dans le 'Roman-cerillo Cat.', p. p. Milá y Fontanals, Gerineldo est rangé parmi les *canciones romancescas*.

Cette version est un curieux spécimen de la "fabrication" de nos jours dans le genre "romancesque." En partie elle se caractérise comme une simple émeute littéraire; en partie, c'est original, mais d'invention piteuse; aussi les motifs nouveaux sont-ils loin de compenser les omissions regrettables dans les passages empruntés. Le style est souvent ampoulé et déparé par des fioritures d'un goût médiocre (par exemple au vers 20: "el rapaz, niño Cupido"; v. 30, 31, "el hechizo atractivo de su amor." Qu'on compare avec ces tournures recherchées celles de A4, telles que "el buen rey enfurecido" (v. 106), qui rendent si admirablement le ton naïf d'une poésie vraiment populaire).

Les cinq premières strophes (vers 1-40) racontent qu'à Constantinople un jeune officier russe, étant au service du sultan comme "capitán de su guardia y secretario efectivo," s'éprend d'Enildas la "sultana favorita del gran Sultán." Pour les strophes suivantes, le compilateur a transcrit presque littéralement de nombreux passages de A4, comme il résulte du tableau de concordance que voici:

A5.	A4.
VERS.	VERS.
41, 42	1, 2
63, 64	3, 4
69, 70	5, 6
71-74	9-12
77-80	13-16
(87, 88	17, 18)
105-119	79-93
121-126	95-100
129-135	101-107
137-139	109-111
141-144	113-118,

de sorte que les cinq derniers huitains (xiv-xviii) coïncident presque mot à mot avec les vers 79-118 de la romance précédente. Pour le reste, on conte fleurette (vi-ix); aucune idée nouvelle, beaucoup de remplissage banal. À remarquer que l'invitation, sans précisément partir de Gerineldo, est pourtant amenée par son verbiage amoureux; la scène d'amour est passée sous silence, ainsi que celle où, dans les autres versions, le poète s'est si dramatiquement prévalu de l'épée du Roi; il n'y a même plus de découverte faite par le Sultan, car Gerineldo s'aperçoit à temps de son lever intempestif. Conformément au caractère

séculier de notre ère, il n'est pas question d'une conversion de la Sultane ni même d'un mariage formel, bien que dans la première phase de son amour le brave officier se fasse fort de sacrifier son idole à sa foi (vers 53-56).

6. Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
paje del Rey más querido. 1, 2.

Version de vingt-six couples de vers, recueillie à Grado (Asturie) de la bouche de Juana Bernaldo, de Santianes de Molenes, et p. p. Pidal, 'Colección . . .', No. 3.

Les trois romances A6, 7, 8 se rapprochent du groupe 1, 2, 3; nombre de détails cependant, et surtout la conclusion, font supposer un original différent. La diction de ces versions asturiennes est purement populaire; aussi M. Pidal (p. 284) opine-t-il qu'elles sont "todas de interés innegable y no tan ataviadas á la moderna mi mucho menos, como gratuitamente supuso el sábio editor del Romancero castellano (D. Agustin Durán)." 35

Dans les derniers vers de la scène d'ouverture (1-12) est mentionnée la mère de l'Infante. À l'heure où Gerineldo vient appeler la Princesse, . . .

La Reina, con ser Reina,
aun no se había dormido:

elle réveille le Roi pour lui communiquer les appréhensions qui troublent son repos (13-20). Scène de l'épée 36 (21-34), suivie, le lendemain matin, de l'entretien du Roi et du page *aborrecido*: 37

"Qu'as-tu, Gerineldo?
¿Hízote mal el mi pan,
ó te hizo mal el mi vino"? 38

La réponse effrontée de Gerineldo, disant qu'on lui demande de restituer un "coffre" égaré de l'Infante, dont il ne sait rien, est

35 'Romo. Gral.' i, p. 176, la nôtre après le No. 320.

36 On y trouve intercalés deux vers (27, 28) éminemment "chrétiens" et étrangers aux autres versions, sauf les congénères A7 et 8.

37 "Triste, abatido, enfadado consigo mismo"; note de M. Pidal. Il me paraît qu'il doit y avoir une lacune après le vers 36: la proposition est incomplète et la situation n'est éclaircie par aucun des détails qui l'animent dans les autres versions.

38 Des vers analogues, où entrent également le *pan* et le *vino*, se trouvent fréquemment dans la poésie populaire de la Péninsule; voir, par exemple, les Nos. 23 (19-22) et 83 (29, 30) du recueil de M. Pidal.

habilement parée par ces paroles ironiques du Roi; "Dese cofre . . . la mi espada es buen testigo," auxquelles est ajouté l'ordre péremptoire d'épouser la Princesse ou de lui chercher mari. Lorsque le page objecte que son père n'a pas de quoi la vêtir: "Eh bien! fait le Roi, baille-lui une robe de burat, puisqu'elle n'a pas mieux mérité"!

7. Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
paje del Rey más querido. 1, 2.

Quarante couples de vers. No. 4 du recueil de M. Pidal, qui s'est fait chanter cette romance à Boal (Asturie) par José García Mendez, de Figueiredo.

Version très semblable à la précédente, jusque dans la tournure des phrases, et avec la même conclusion, mais sans les retranchements qu'on constate dans A6. Ainsi la visite nocturne de Gerineldo (qui s'annonce par un soupir; 13-28), de même que son congé de l'Infantina (qui se réveille au froid contact de l'épée; 53-62) reprennent leur place dans le récit avec tous les détails des autres versions légitimes. Mais la Reine n'est pas mentionnée, et un *paxarin*,³⁹ ami de Gerineldo, cherche à disperser les soupçons du Roi, réveillé d'un sommeil inquiet ("Gerineldo va en el baile . . .").

8. Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
mi caballero pulido. 1, 2.

No. 5 du recueil de M. Pidal, qui se l'est fait réciter à Grado par José Fernandez, de Santianes de Molenes. Trente-six couples de vers, avec un appendice de vingt-sept couples.

L'invitation (1-10); la Princesse refuse d'abord d'ouvrir la porte de son boudoir (v. 21 et suiv.: ¿Cuál es el hombre traidor. . .?). La scène d'amour (27-30) présente ici une forme, si l'on veut, plus réaliste. Episode de l'épée. Congédié par l'Infante, Gerineldo se rend de son propre mouvement à l'appartement du Roi et lui offre sa tête, non cependant sans produire une lâche excuse ("Déme la muerte, buen Rey,—ella la culpa ha tenido").—Même pointe épigrammatique que dans A6 et 7: le mariage aura lieu le lendemain à midi.

Gerineldo alors, animé d'une généreuse am-

39 Diminutif de libre formation populaire,—pgs. *pagesinho*.

bition, résout de gagner à la guerre les richesses et honneurs qui le feront l'égal de la Princesse:

8 bis. Yo iré á la guerra, Señor,
para echárselo mas fino (savoir: el vestido).

De cette façon est rattachée à notre romance une autre, rapportée d'ordinaire au Conde Sol; voir là-dessus les lumineuses remarques de M. Pidal, p. 285.

Le *babel*, dont M. Pidal, p. x, déplore le rapide déclin, se fait moins sentir dans les trois versions A6, 7, 8 que dans la suivante: 40

9. Gerineldo, Gerineldo,
mi camarero benino. 1, 2.

Recueillie en été 1886 à Cangas de Tineo (Asturies) et p. p. M. Munthe, 'Folkpoesi,' i, No. 2 (p. 7 et suiv.). Trente-quatre couples de vers sans la *cuadra* finale et l'introduction apocryphe. À rapprocher plutôt du groupe A1-3 que de A6-8; indépendante dans certains détails.

L'invitation est précédée de sept vers constituant une introduction particulière à cette version: pendant que Gerineldo abreuve ses chevaux *á los corrientes del mar* (!) il entonne un chant, qui attire l'attention de l'Infante. (Six autres vers apocryphes, encore préposés à ceux-là, n'ont rien à voir du tout à notre romance et paraissent empruntés à une poésie tout étrangère. Ils disent que la scène se passait au beau mois de mai, lorsque toute la nature rayonnait et que les amants s'adonnaient aux jouissances de l'amour).⁴¹

Le Roi voit en songe le malheur de sa maison; il court à la chambre de sa fille, une lance à la main, mais il hésite de tuer Gerineldo, parce que ce n'est pas lui qu'il faut inculper du crime! (27-42). La Princesse envoie Gerineldo cueillir des fleurs au jardin (43-54). Arrêté par le Roi, il se jette à ses pieds pour subir la peine méritée. Le Roi leur impose comme châtiment "antes que cheguen á diez de ser mujer y marido" (55-68). Dans une *cuadra* apocryphe, Gerineldo dit avoir fait

40 Où nous trouvons des formes telles que *isgraciado*=desgr. . . , *tás*=estás, *cheguen*, *há*=(yo) *hē*, *cuchiendo*=cogiendo, etc.

41 Pour cette introduction apocryphe, Mme. de Vasconcellos me renvoie à un article de la *Revista Lusitana*, Vol. ii, fasc. 2., lequel cependant est encore pour paraître.

serment de ne pas épouser une femme qui a été sa maîtresse.

Une romance tout indépendante de trente et un couples de vers se rattache à la version donnée par M. Munthe :

9 bis. Fué publicado la guetra
En Francia y en Portugal.

Gerineldo est fait *capitán general*; lorsqu'il ne revient pas après une absence de sept ans, l'Infante prend des vêtements de *romera* pour aller à sa recherche. Après de longues pérégrinations, elle apprend d'un vacher que Gerineldo est à la veille de ses noces; elle va demander l'aumône à son ancien amant, et elle doit souffrir l'humiliation d'être chassée de la salle festive par sa rivale. Ayant cependant trahi sa haute naissance, elle est reconnue par Gerineldo, qui abandonne pour elle son bonheur nouveau.

10. "Lo romans de Girineldo":

.

Version chantée au Maroc, communiquée, par un nommé T. de C., à la *Renaxensa, revista catalana de literatura, ciencias y arts, Any* iii, No. 3, selon Milá y Fontanals, 'Poesía her.', p. 356, note 2.

Comme il était impossible de se procurer en Allemagne la revue mentionnée et que Milá y Fontanals n'a pas copié le texte de la romance ni même expressément indiqué si, oui ou non, elle est en langue castillane, je ne suis pas bien sûr qu'elle le soit. Voici les quelques remarques que nous trouvons insérées dans la 'Poes. her.' sur l'origine et les personnages de cette version :

"No m'ha faltat paciència per ferme cantar per una de aquestas juivas que encara sembla que conservan esma de la patria espanyola, lo romans de Girineldo que t'envio tan cabal com he pogut lograrlo. . . . Com veurás, lo que t'envio es mes llarch y's parla en ell cap á l'ultim de la dona Maria de Linares en qui's torna la princesa y de capitá general 'Conde Niño,' com si fos lo mateix sastre (!) Girineldo que ha comensat :

Cortando paño de seda
para hacer al rey vestido."

En cas que cette dernière observation renferme une allusion à des services de chambellan que remplirait le *capitá* dans la version du Maroc, je me sentirais la tentation de la tenir pour catalane, parce que de toutes les

autres variantes l'une des semi-catalanes (B1) est la seule où ces services soient mentionnés d'une façon analogue. Pour le reste nous apprenons que le texte doit être d'une étendue assez considérable et que, offrant le nom du Conde Niño, il serait peut-être à ranger sous un des groupes voisins de romances.

B. Les romances semi-catalanes.

Milá y Fontanals, 'Rillo. Cat.', n'en donne que deux fragmentaires de la Catalogne proprement dite (v. p. xi). Mais encore ces deux versions—retouches vulgarisées du groupe A1-3—sont malheureusement "de las que's cantan ab una gran barreja de paraulas castellanas" (Pelay Briz, 'Cansons de la Terra,' ii 222). Quant à la diction, à remarquer le parallélisme très prononcé, qui d'ailleurs dans aucune autre littérature populaire ne paraît prédominer au même point que dans la catalane.

1. Aquí estaba Gerineldo
junto á una ventana fría.

Milá y Fontanals 'Rillo. Cat.,' No. 269, n'en donne que trois courts fragments (seize vers, dont seulement trois en catalan):

Pendant que Gerineldo vaque à ses fonctions de page en nettoyant les vêtements de soie de son royal maître, l'Infante passe et le requiert d'amours (1-6)

L'endemà á la matinada,⁴²

le Roi demande en vain ses vêtements (7-10). . . . Attendrissement du Roi; le denouement est ébauché en ces vers :

Mejor será que los casi,
nada ningú no sabría.
11-16.

2. Arinello, Arinello,
Arinello Pampolino.
1, 2.

Milá y Fontanals 'Rillo Cat.,' No. 269B: le dernier tiers de la romance est assez intact (v. 9-32); pour le reste, seulement quelques vers décousus. En tout trente-deux vers, sur lesquels cinq catalans.

Le Roi souhaite la bienvenue à Arinello, qui prétend venir de cueillir des fleurs dans le *camaril* (9-16). La Princesse survient et cherche par ses prières à arracher au Roi le consentement à son mariage avec Arinello :

⁴² Vers stéréotype dans la poésie populaire catalane, comme aussi le vers B2, 16.

"Comment veux-tu que je te le donne encore pour mari, si tu l'as déjà pris? . . . Mieux vaut toutefois les marier puisque déjà ils se sont tant aimés" (17-32).

Selon Milá y Fontanals, il existe une troisième version, toute analogue à la précédente, "aunque mas catalanizada."⁴³

C. Les versions portugaises.

1. Reginaldo, Reginaldo,
pagem d'elrei tam querido.
1, 2.

Garrett, 'Romanceiro,' ii, No. 9, p. 158 et suiv.; Hardung i, p. 109. Ce n'est pas, comme toutes les autres versions commentées, la reproduction d'une romance chantée dans une contrée déterminée du royaume; c'est plutôt une compilation de divers fragments venus de l'Alemtéjo, de l'Estramadure, du Ribatéjo, du Haut et du Bas-Béira, du Minho et d'Oporto. Garrett et le poète A. F. de Castilho, à qui il devait une partie du texte,⁴⁴ ont concouru à le perfectionner coûte que coûte, de sorte que tous les passages non justifiés par les autres versions sont suspects quant à leur authenticité comme poésie populaire.⁴⁵ À cet égard donc, la présente romance ne mériterait point d'ouvrir la série des versions portugaises, mais devrait y être annexée comme texte semi-apocryphe. On peut cependant alléguer en sa faveur que de toutes les variantes imprimées elle a été la première publiée et que, partant, elle a été la souche de notre connaissance de la légende dans la Péninsule.

Quarante-neuf couples de vers dans la version de l'Alemtéjo, que je désignerai par C1a; dans celle du Ribatéjo, C1b: quatre-vingt-huit

⁴³ On ne pourra espérer trouver un jour le texte complet des romances catalanes d'Eginhard ou la notation de leur mélodie dans la seconde partie du 'Rillo Cat.,' dont on attend la publication. L'éditeur des 'Obras completas de Milá y Fontanals,' M. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, écrivit à Mme. de Vasconcellos, à la date du 6 Novembre, 1889:

"La 2a. parte del Rillo Cat. no contiene rr. nuevos, sino observaciones, notas, apéndices, y concordancias con las canciones populares de otros países. No es trabajo acabado, pero yo quiero publicar todo lo que existe y quizá me aventure á completar algunas secciones . . . No he encontrado hasta ahora noticia alguna que se refiera á los fragmentos de rr. de Gerineldo. Son de los muchos que Milá no llegó á comentar por haberle faltado la vida."

⁴⁴ V. son 'Romanceiro,' i, p. xv, xvi.

⁴⁵ V. aussi le jugement de M. Pidal, p. 281: "abunda en circunstancias y escenas diferentes y es mucho mas extensa; cualidades que dicen poco en pró de su antigüedad."

couples de vers, ou cinquante-deux après élimination des couplets additionnels assonnant en -d.

L'invitation est amplifiée d'une *quadra* dans la version de l'Alemtéjo (mais non en Estramadure). L'Infante *fait ouvrir la porte* à Reginaldo par ses compagnes (*aias*; 17-32). Lorsque le Roi s'aperçoit de l'absence de son page *la réponse évasive des* "vasallos que tudo tinham sentido" suscite ses soupçons (33-44). Il se munit d'un poignard—d'un *traçado* ou *terçado* "coutelas," en Estramadure—et, visitant toutes les salles du palais, finit par découvrir les amants assoupis dans le boudoir de l'Infante, où il entre inaperçu (45-54). Ici ce *sont les vassaux qui surviennent* et qui, voyant le Roi perdu de rage, réussissent pourtant à arrêter d'une justice trop prompte: Il se contente de déposer son poignard d'or entre les deux dormeurs, *le tranchant tourné contre le page*, comme bien on pense (55-62), de façon que celui-ci, au premier mouvement involontaire qu'il fait, vient à le heurter et à s'égratigner la peau. L'Infante, *réveillée par son amant en angoisse*, lui conseille de se jeter aux pieds du Roi, qui est "doux et compatissant"; en cas d'inflexibilité de son père, elle lui *promet de mourir avec lui* (63-76; dans une variante du Bas-Béira, l'Infante est assez hardie pour prédire avec certitude que le Roi va les marier!). De rencontre avec le Roi, Reginaldo, après quelques détours, s'offre pour subir le supplice mérité et qui paraît inévitable (77-88).

Mais bientôt le Roi s'attendrit (vers 91-94=C3, 51-54) et, par une tournure épigrammatique, inflige à son page le châtimement de prendre pour épouse l'Infante dont il s'est fait aimer (vers 89-98 de la version de l'Alemtéjo C1a; un autre texte de la même province ajoute encore six vers: les vassaux envient le bonheur de Reginaldo).

Suite de C1b: Le Roi, à qui, après tout, les délinquents ne laissent pas d'inspirer de la compassion, résout d'enfermer Reginaldo "pour commencement de peine."⁴⁶ Les vassaux rassemblés pour délibérer sur le sort du hardi page sont unanimes à décider qu'il a forfait corps et avoir (89-104).

Dans la version du Ribatéjo, il y a encore la scène du *donjon*, aussi pathétique et émou-

vante en elle qu'elle est étrangère à la véritable tradition conservée dans cette famille de romances. En voici l'analyse: Jeté dans le cachot, Reginaldo se morfond plus d'un an à attendre l'exécution de la sentence portée contre lui, quand sa mère vient le voir une dernière fois. Elle remplit l'air de ses plaintes déchirantes:

"Lasse! pauvre veuve que je suis! que t'ai-je nourri avec tant de peine, que t'ai-je confié à un si bon maître, si tu finis par l'abuser si honteusement! . . . Mais, avant de mourir, ô mon fils, laisse-moi entendre, une fois encore, ton chant"! (105-134).

Ce n'est qu'après les instances réitérées de sa mère que Reginaldo entonne la chanson que son père aimait à chanter la veille de la Saint-Jean (135-152). Le Roi, instruit par l'Infante de ce que ce chant harmonieux ne part pas d'anges ou de sirènes, mais bien du *triste sem ventura* qu'il a condamné à mort, révoque la sentence et marie les deux fidèles amants (153-168).

La retouche de Garrett, resp. de Castilho, s'accuse dans les vers (2-6), 17-24, 29-34, 41-44, 53-58, 61-64, 83-84, abstraction faite d'autres altérations, telles que le renvoi dans la scène finale de la *quadra* 91-94.

Nous retournons aux versions purement populaires, qui sont nombreuses en Portugal:

2. Gerinaldo, Gerinaldo,
pagem de el-rei mais querido. 1, 2,

Th. Braga, 'Canco. e Romo. geral,' iii, No. 6; Hardung i, p. 101; traduite par le Comte de Puymaigre, 'Romanceiro: Choix de vieux chants portugais,' Paris, 1881, No. 33. Version de Trás-os-Montes: "este romance cantase em Freixo de Espadacinta" (Braga, iii, p. 171). Vingt-neuf couples de vers; variante intégrale, vulgarisée dans les expressions; formes dialectales (*trupido*, *castillo*, *pequechinho*, *espulverido*,⁴⁶ *mangar*).

⁴⁶ *Pequechinho* (v. 36), doublet vulgaire de *poucochinho* (C3, 29), dans l'acception de "petit," les idées de "peu" et de "petit" se confondant facilement dans l'imagination du peuple; il est vrai que pour un individu très mince il existe le diminutif *pequerruchinho* et *pequerrucho*, mais on n'en saurait déduire de primitif; ces formes ne peuvent être rapprochées de *peco* "simple, imbécille."

Espulverido (v. 50), mot tout à fait inusité; il désigne l'état d'une personne qui, brusquement réveillée du sommeil, a l'air ébrouillé et malpropre.

Gerinaldo, nu-pieds, même nu-jambes, frappe à la porte du boudoir de la Princesse, où il est admis après s'être nommé (13-24). Le Roi fait un songe, qui a toutes les apparences de la réalité: "ou l'on défloie l'Infante, ou on m'enlève le château"! (25-28).—Gerinaldo se réveille le premier, restant "plus mort que vif"; sa maîtresse l'encourage (41-48). Interpellé par le Roi, Gerinaldo tout déconcerté feint d'abord de rentrer de la chasse,⁴⁷ puis, d'avoir "arrosé les fleurs, qui en étaient bien nécessiteuses"! Le Roi coupe court à ses propos mensongers par un généreux pardon, lui donnant l'Infante pour épouse (49-58).

3. Gerinaldo, Gerinaldo,
pagem do Roi bem querido. 1, 2.

Braga, 'C. e R. G.,' iv, No. 30; Hardung, i, p. 104: "Versão da ilha de São Miguel." Quarante-et-un couples de vers; texte vulgarisé, diction négligée.

Le deuxième aineã (13-28) s'est accru ici d'une *quadra* contenant les offres amoureuses de l'Infante. Choqué par l'absence du page, "le bon du Roi" se lève, s'habille et ne rougit pas de parcourir nu-pieds, et les souliers en main, tous les couloirs et tous les compartiments du palais, pour aboutir au lit de sa fille⁴⁸ (41-50). Gerinaldo est encouragé par l'Infante: "Si le Roi ordonne de te tuer, j'avance que tu es mon mari; s'il t'interroge, ne lui nie pas l'affaire"! (57-68). Se rencontrant avec le Roi, Gerinaldo feint d'avoir arrosé le jardin potager (*a horta*), puis, d'avoir donné la chasse aux ramiers. Le Roi lui accorde la main de sa fille en disant avec bonhomie: "Je m'étais déjà promis de te donner ta tourterelle"!—ne pouvant toutefois supprimer cette réflexion aigre-douce: "Mais elle aurait montré plus de jugement en choisissant un de plus haut rang"! (77-82).

⁴⁷ Le vers C2, 51 étant trop court, on pourra le redresser en lisant: "Eu venho de matar caça."

⁴⁸ Au vers 30, au lieu de "O rei andava erguido," il faudra peut-être corriger: "O rei tinha recordado," puisque le Roi ne se lève réellement qu'au vers 41. C'est aussi pourquoi les vers 33, 34 sont évidemment de trop: ils anticipent l'action exprimée dans les vers 45, 46 et troublent la marche du récit.

Un autre mode de débrouiller ce chaos consisterait à supprimer ou les vers 29-34 ou les vers 41-46, chacun de ces passages suffisant pour lui seul à maintenir l'intégrité du récit: nous aurions alors une coalescence de deux versions différentes en une seule.

4. Girinaldo, Girinaldo,
pagem d'El-rei tão querido.

1, 2.

Ib., No. 31; Hardung i, p. 106. "Variante da ilha de S. Jorge." Après suppression de la tirade 65-76 assonnant en -d et visiblement interpolée, il reste trente-cinq couples de vers.

Les alinéas 1-12, 13-24 (sans la *quadra* additionnelle de C3), 25-34, 35-40, 41-48, 49-64 coïncident à peu près avec les six alinéas correspondants (vers 1-68) de la romance précédente: à relever comme détail que le Roi tourne le tranchant du coutelas—v. 45: *cultello*, v. 53: *punhal*—contre sa fille pour indiquer symboliquement que c'est elle qui est surtout coupable ("que a morte tinha mer'cido," v. 48).

La scène finale, l'entretien du Roi et de Girin., se réduit aux paroles bienveillantes du premier, qui daigne faire asseoir à la table royale son "cher gendre" frais émoulu du vasselage (77-82).

Après le vers 64 est intercalé l'épisode du chant de Girin., que nous avons trouvé plus complet comme appendice à la romance C1b (C4, 65-72=C1b 157-164). Le vers 64 (la Princesse enjoint à Girin. de faire résonner un chant en cas qu'il soit emprisonné) n'a évidemment reçu cette forme que pour rattacher cet épisode au corps de la romance; primitivement il aura égalé le vers C3, 66.

5. "Estoria de Gerinaldo":
Gerinaldo, Gerinaldo,
pagem d'el-rei tão amigo.

1, 2.

Version recueillie à Calheta et p. p. M. Azevedo, 'Romo. do Archip. da Madeira,' p. 63 et suiv. Sans la conclusion apocryphe, trente

49 Encore ici une révision du texte est indispensable pour redresser les incongruités du récit. Les vers 27, 28 sont à supprimer ou à changer. Autrement, en serrant le texte des 3e. et 4e. alinéas tel qu'il est là, nous arrivons au curieux tableau que voici: À peine est-il onze heures, que le Roi se lève et va de salle en salle, d'une porte à l'autre, appelant Girin. pour lui apporter ses vêtements. S. M. T. F. marche donc toute nue, ce qui équivaut à un souverain mépris des moindres gênes imposées par l'étiquette. Ce qui rehausse le grotesque de la scène c'est que le Roi, suivant ainsi la piste de son page amouraché, tient ses souliers en main "para menos ser sentido," précaution que précisément dans cette version Girin. même a négligée en se rendant chez la Princesse!—Cependant, trêve de digression! Il ne s'agissait que d'exemplifier sur un cas déterminé jusqu'où peut aller la naïve insouciance de ces rhapsodes populaires.

couples de vers. Se rapproche (comme A6, 7, 8 et C2, 3, 4) beaucoup du groupe A1, 2, 3; quelques traits particuliers (vers 41: "Ao despois, *accordam elles*"; 47, 48: "Eu, se mato minha filha, fica lo throno sósinho"; 47, 48: "Se tu foges, Gerinaldo, Eu tamben fujo comtigo"). Naïve excuse du page (cf. A8, C6); le Roi lui accorde la main de sa fille:

Não és da mesma igualha,
Mas és lo seu escolhido.

Appendice (v. 61-70): Le page soutient que lui aussi est issu de sang royal, "de bastardia de França": il porte même sa légitimation (*cartel*) sur lui! Le mariage est célébré par des fêtes splendides.

6. Gerinaldo, Gerinaldo,
Lindo conde meu tão qu'rido.

1, 2.

Recueillie à Porto da Cruz (Madère) et p. p. M. Azevedo, p. 66 et suiv.; trente-trois couples de vers sans la *quadra* finale illégitime.

La nuit, l'amant se fait connaître comme "vosso captivo, lo conde Gerinaldinho." L'Infante lui jette une échelle de corde de soie pour qu'il monte inaperçu. Ayant découvert les coupables, le Roi est près de se laisser emporter à la rage (vers 40; cf. C5, 33: "Quedo el-rei se ficou"!). La *quadra* qui termine cette version, présente une plaisanterie un peu malicieuse; la voici:

Gerinaldo lá casou
Com uma filha de rei;
Mas, se la gosou donzella,
Não sou eu que jurarei.

7. (Vem la filha do rei, e diz:)
Leonardo, Leonardo,
Pagem d'el-rei tão querido.

1, 2.

Romance trouvée à Camara de Lobos (Madère) et p. p. M. Azevedo, p. 69 et suiv., trente-huit couples de vers. Texte très défiguré; le premier alinéa est bien conservé; les vers 17-28 sont encore légitimes pour le fond, mais retouchés pour la forme et déparés par des fioritures et enflures: ass. -ir; pour les autres assonances anormales, v. note 29.

Dans la scène d'exposition les conseils de précaution donnés par l'Infante sont plus détaillés (v. 13-16). Comme ni ellé, ni Leonardo n'apparaissent le matin, le Roi se demande: "Minha filha, onde 'stás?" Dans la suite, le

rhapsode s'est visiblement hâté⁵⁰ pour arriver à la longue scène finale (51-76), tout étrangère aux autres versions, sauf C1b. Vivement exhorté par son amante à chercher le salut dans la fuite (37-42), Leon. ne peut exécuter ce projet parce que le Monarque indigné sort à sa rencontre et, malgré ses faux-fuyants, ordonne aux gardes de le mettre à mort (43-50). Voilà que la Princesse survient et s'offre à périr avec son amant, si le Roi ne permet pas qu'elle l'épouse (51-56). Un conseil est convoqué, mais "les grands du palais" évitent de se prononcer librement, ne voulant se brouiller ni avec le Roi ni avec l'Infante :

Que, s'el-rei entflo reinava,
Viria la filh'a reinar.

57-64.

Le Roi, dans ces circonstances, se voit forcé de céder; il sauve toutefois les apparences en parlant "comme qui sait parler."⁵¹ Il fait élargir Leon. et l'amener par les nobles en cortège solennel pour que le mariage s'accomplisse dans l'église, le jour même (65-76).

Les trois versions C5-7, comme la plupart des pièces du 'Romo. d'Azevedo,' sont accompagnées d'une sorte de *scenari*—eux aussi visiblement d'origine populaire—disant par exemple: (après C7 16) "A hora dara, Leon. à porta."; (ap. 6, 34) "E correu el-rei á alcova da filha"; (ap. 6, 46) "El-rei deixou ficar lo seu punhal, e foi-se imbora. Ella despois accorda, e crama"; (ap. 5, 50) "Vae Gerinardo deitá-se aos pés d'el-rei, e falla."; (ap. 7, 50) "E logo lo prenderam para ir a morrer"; (ap. 7, fin) "E tudo se fez como el-rei mandou."

Souvent ces *indicações scenicas* ne sont d'aucun secours pour l'entendement du texte; quelquefois, cependant, elles remplacent même une partie du récit, comme cela arrive dans C6, après le v. 46, où le réveil des amants est uniquement indiqué par le *scenario*.

⁵⁰ De sorte que, en supprimant l'amplification des vers 13-16 et en supposant à la romance la conclusion qu'on trouve dans les autres versions (c'est-à-dire, en remplaçant les vers 49, 50 par les vers 75, 76), elle n'aurait que vingt-trois couples de vers.

⁵¹ Suivent les vers 67-70 :

"Criei-lo de pequenino, Nã no hei de degolar;
Se mando morrer la filha, Ninguém tenho a quem herdar,"
qui, dans les autres variantes, font partie de l'épisode de l'épée.

8. General, general, (sic!)
General mais querido,

1, 2.

p.p. M. Reis Damaso, "Romances," dans les "Tradições . . . , Encycl. Rep." (1882), p. 235; Vingt-sept couples de vers.

De tous les textes que nous commentons, celui-ci et le suivant sont les plus corrompus: tant pour la versification⁵² que pour le récit, qui est amplifié par des détails d'une répugnante banalité.

L'invitation ne compte que neuf vers; omission après v. 5.—La visite nocturne (10-17) bien conservée; "Seu pae que desconfiou" trouve les amants face contre face, comme femme et mari; hésitations; il laisse "ses armes" entre eux (18-31): La Princesse, au réveil, conseille à General d'implorer à genoux le pardon du Roi et de pleurer comme un enfant; "il n'est pas assez cruel pour ne pas nous marier!" (32-40). La conclusion—imploration de General, que le Roi accepte pour son "genro querido" (41-48)—paraît être le mieux transmise. Dans les six vers apocryphes qui suivent, le nouveau gendre produit ses titres de noblesse: il se donne pour le parent des rois d'Espagne et de Cascaes et du saint-père même: "Diga el-Rey qual seja mais!"

9.
.
D. Alberto, D. Alberto,
O nosso somno foi sabido,

1, 2.

Fragment de huit couples de vers trouvé à Lagoas en Algarbie; p. p. Reis Damaso, ib., p. 184.

Ce n'est que la fin de la légende; les premiers six vers correspondent à C8 33-39; l'imploration 7, 8; la *quadra* finale 13-16= C8 45-48. Les titres de noblesse (9-12) précèdent

⁵² Partout où nous ne trouvons pas l'assonance régulière, il y a des désordres que nous n'essayerons pas toujours de ramener à l'état normal. Après C8, 2 il manque un vers, et 36 est de trop (anticipé du discours du Roi; cf. v. 45), de façon qu'à partir de 3 jusqu'à 35, les vers de nombre impair ont l'assonance. À constater d'autres anomalies dans 18-20 et 41, 42 [assonance exceptionnelle -ou(?)-oubien chute de vers(?)]. D'autres suppressions résultent de notre analyse. Pour *General*, v. noté 60.

Dans C9, les 8e et 9e lignes doivent ne former qu'un seul vers, *El-Rey* ou *meu senhor* étant à retrancher. La *quadra* additionnelle, assonnant en *d-e, d-i*.

⁵³ Au v. 15, à restituer *vasallo* au lieu de *eras filho*.

ici ce quatrain, comme pour motiver la décision favorable du Roi.

Encore qu'il y ait un rapport d'affinité très marqué entre toutes les versions de la romance, on comprend qu'il est impossible d'en établir une filiation exacte et d'assigner à chacune d'elles une place déterminée dans l'arbre généalogique de la famille. C'est pourquoi je me désisterai de dresser un tableau synoptique et me bornerai au rapide résumé que voici.

Nous avons vu, somme toute, que :

a. parmi les versions castillanes, A3, et ensuite A1, sont assurément les plus anciennes; preuve l'extrême concision de la forme, qui va en se détériorant de A3 et A1 en A2 et A4, de A4 en A5; A6-9 se sont encore conservé le caractère de *versiones castizas*;

b. Les romances senji-catalanes se rattachent à peu près aux vieilles versions castillanes, tandis que

c. Les portugaises forment un groupe plus indépendant; entre elles, C2 présente la meilleure leçon et se rapproche, comme C3 et sa variante C4, des groupes A1-3 et A6-8; C5 et 9 offrent des textes dégénérés, mais toujours légitimes, et seulement des fragments de C1 peuvent être considérés comme de la véritable poésie populaire (mais, en partie, d'un haut âge).

CHAPITRE III.

Examen comparé des motifs constitutifs de la légende d'Eginhard en Espagne.

Le dépouillement terminé, j'aborde un rapide examen comparé des éléments constitutifs dont se composent les romances de Gerineldo. Je mets en parangon l'original latin de la tradition,⁵⁴ sans toutefois le prendre pour point de départ, parce que évidemment il n'a servi de fondement immédiat à aucune des versions poétiques conservées.

a. BONHEUR DES AMANTS.

1. L'historique au sujet de la Princesse, que donne la chronique à Lorsch (Imma . . . regi

⁵⁴ V. 'Monumenta Germ.,' *Scriptores* t. xxi, p. 358-359.

Grecorum desponsata cet.), manque dans les romances. A5 en a reçu un autre, plus remarquable par son étendue que par le charme de la description, lequel d'ailleurs s'occupe également ou même davantage de l'amant.

2. L'invitation adressée à Gerineldo par l'Infante; commune à toutes les versions, hors les fragmentaires A2, 3, C9 (sautée par Milá y Fontanals dans B2). Cet attachant dialogue servant d'ouverture au poème lui donne dès l'abord l'empreinte d'une rare vivacité. Dans A1, 4, 6, 7; C2, 3, 4 il comprend uniformément les premiers douze vers, preuve déjà d'une homogénéité marquée. Dans A2, où il est assez corrompu, une *cuadra* en plus, de même dans C7, où la Princesse ajoute des conseils de précaution, et dans la version de l'Alemtéjo C1, qui, en polissant les deux lignes de souhait, en a fait six (—retouche de Garrett?). Dans A5, pas moins de cinq à sept huitains (vers 25, resp. 41 à 80), amplification assez gauche. Quant à B1, on ne saurait reconnaître exactement si l'invitation y est au complet; il paraît toutefois que non, parce que autrement ce serait la seule version sans dialogue, la seule où manquerait l'apostrophe typique: "Gerineldo, Gerineldo, etc." La légende latine ne sait rien encore de cette invitation; au contraire, c'est Eginhard qui "novissimè de semet ipso sumpta fiducia" va surprendre la Princesse. Il y a un peu de cela aussi dans la romance A5.

3. L'entrevue nocturne (A1, 3-5, 7-9; C1-8), fort analogue dans toutes les romances, à peu de différences près: ainsi, quelques versions parlent des mesures de précaution que prend Gerineldo en se rendant chez l'Infante (A1 "sandálias de seda," C1 "calçou çapato de panno"; dans C2, etc., il marche nu-pieds), d'autres n'en font pas mention; dans A7, 9; C1, 3, 6 Ger. s'annonce par des soupirs; dans A9, C1 et 6 il se donne pour le *cautibo*, *captivo* de sa maîtresse; enfin la scène d'amour est peinte avec des degrés divers de discrétion. Les deux éléments de cet épisode sont assez fidèlement imités du prototype latin: "nocturno tempore latenter ad puellae tendebat habitaculum. Ibidem ergo pulsans clanculo et intrare permissus . . . solus cum sola cupito satisfacit amori." L'invention n'y paraît guère moins poétique que dans nos romances!

b. CATASTROPHE.

4. Le songe du Roi. A7, 9; C2 présentent un récit particulier: le Roi va trouver son page par suite d'un songe sinistre (*sueño des-pavorido, pezado*) renfermant un mauvais augure tout à fait déterminé ("que de beras le ha salido," A9; "que bem certo lhe sabia," C2). Encore dans A1, 3, 8 il se réveille d'un cauchemar, mais qui ne contient point un présage; dans quelques versions (A4, B1, C1) parce que le jour commence à poindre; dans d'autres (C5, 6) sans qu'il y ait une raison d'indiquée, même avant minuit (C3 4), de sorte qu'on devra supposer une insomnie. C7 et 8 diffèrent un peu, et dans A6 le Roi est réveillé par la Reine soupçonneuse. Dans nombre de romances, il est rendu soupçonneux parce que, à ses cris réitérés, le page n'apparaît pas pour lui donner ses vêtements.

Dans le récit latin, il y a bien l'insomnie du Roi: "eam noctem divino, ut creditur, nutu insomnem duxit," mais on n'en parle qu'après le réveil des dormeurs, de l'étrange sortie de qui le souverain est témoin. Point de soupçons préalables!

5. Le Roi (s'habille A4, 8; C2, 4, se munit d'une épée—dans A7 il décroche même de la muraille l'épée d'or, la plus tranchante qu'il ait—parcourt le château et) découvre les amants assoupis (A1, 3-9, C1-8).

6. Lutte intérieure et attendrissement du Roi, scène de l'épée (A1, 3, 4, 6-9; C1-7, 9). B1 se termine avec les réflexions conciliantes du Roi. A5 retranche toute cette scène saisissante; il est vrai qu'un sultan, en découvrant l'infidélité d'une maîtresse, ne saurait guère avoir pour elle les égards et les raisons de ménagement, qui conviennent si bien au roi chrétien vis à vis de sa fille égarée. Cet épisode, comme le précédent, est d'ailleurs parfaitement étranger à la chronique de Lorsch et emprunté à Tristan, où "Marc laisse son gant quand il trouve Tristan endormi près d'Iseut, et séparé d'elle par son épée":⁵⁵ "tambem no thalamo de Brunhilde e Sigurd, e na pyra, se collocou entre ambos uma espada."⁵⁶ Partant du sens que cet usage a eu dans les vieux temps germaniques, M. Pidal

⁵⁵ V. G. Paris, 'Hist. poét.', p. 215.

⁵⁶ Braga, 'C. e R. G.', iii, p. 170, avec plus d'exemples encore.

cherche à prouver que le Roi met son épée entre les deux amants

"como espontánea manifestación del deseo de que no se hubiera consumado la deshonra de su hija, como testigo exculpador; por más que, tiempo despues el pueblo, ignorante ya del simbolismo germano, convirtiese la espada aquella en acusador de la flaqueza de E-nildas."⁵⁷

Il n'y a pas à discuter l'origine de cet épisode ni du sens qu'il a eu primitivement. Mais ne suffirait-il pas de supposer que, dans nos romances, le Roi laisse l'épée simplement pour indiquer que les coupables ont été en son pouvoir?

7. Réveil des amants et congé de Gerineldo (A1, 3-5, 7-9; C1-9). Dans les versions castillanes, la Princesse se réveille la première; dans nombre des portugaises c'est Eginhard, même dans C4, bien que le fil de l'épée y soit tourné contre l'Infante! Seulement deux versions donnent une raison extérieure du réveil: selon A7, 53, 54, "Con el frio de la espada La Infanta ha espavorecido," et dans C1 la peau de Reginaldo est déchirée par l'épée. Dans les versions portugaises, encouragement de Gerenaldo par l'Infante, brièvement indiqué aussi dans quelques-unes des castillanes (A4 et A5, qui ne parle ni de l'assoupissement, ni de l'épée, ni du réveil), tandis que d'autres versions racontent le renvoi du page sans ce détail. Dans les vers A4, 79-82 on "voit un confus souvenir de la conduite matinale faite à Eginhard par la Princesse." Mais il y manque la neige, qui, dans le texte latin, détermine précisément le caractère singulier du congé:

"Interea . . . nivem haut modicam decidisse (Einhardus) cognovit, et ne per vestigia pedum virilium agnitus proderetur, foras exire timuit . . . Tandem elegantissima invencula . . . consilium dedit, ut ipsa quidem super se insidentem inclinata exciperet cet."

Garrett, 'Romo.' ii, p. 155 a dit fort juste: "Talvez o que primeiro contou a historia ao nosso povo . . . omittiu a scena da neve por menos familiar e commum n'estes climas do sul." Un peu plus bas il parle presque avec affection "da bella escena da neve," tandis que M. Braga, 'C. e R. G.', iii, p. 169, paraît moins sensible à l'absence, dans les romances,

⁵⁷ 'Colección . . .', p. 284, également avec l'exemple de Brynhilda.

"da *pequenissima circumstancia* da neve e das pégadas; em nada altera a acção(!); os trovistas do Meio Dia só tiraram da tradição os episódios que conheciam; . . . pintaram a natureza como estavam costumados á vel-a."

La neige manque donc, et partant la précaution et la fine ruse des amants. Si l'on veut, on peut trouver une faible compensation dans l'épisode où, se glissant nuitamment à la chambrette de l'Infante, Gerineldo ôte sa chaussure et porte ses souliers à la main, pour ne point faire de bruit. Voilà du moins aussi une petite ruse inspirée par la précaution, quoique appartenant à une tout autre phase du récit: celle de la venue, et non du départ de Gerineldo.

c. DÉNOUEMENT.

8. Rencontre de Gerineldo et du Roi (A1, 4-9; B2; C1-9). Dans A1, 6-9; C2-6, 8, 9 cette scène, assez variée dans les différentes versions, aboutit à la réunion des amants et termine ainsi le poème: "a versão da ilha de São Jorge (C4) termina com a idea verdadeiramente feudal da distinção á mesa . . . Carlos Magno para elevar o pagem a seu genro senta-o comsigo á mesa" (Braga, 'C. e R. G.', iv, p. 423). C5, 8, 9 mentionne un diplôme de noblesse produit par Gerinaldo. Dans A9; C1a, b, 8, 9 on voit comme un aveu caché fait par le page, qui finit par offrir sa tête pour le supplice mérité: dans C1, le Roi accepte ("Morrerás por atrevido"; A1 aussi finit par la menace de mort prononcée par le Roi). Mais tant C1a que C1b trouvent encore une suite, parce que le Souverain, si autocratique soit-il, s'émeut du sort de sa fille et de Reginaldo: pour la conclusion de C1b, voir notre alinéa 10; la version de l'Alemtéjo C1a se termine par une pointe épigrammatique (vers 88-98, resp. 104). Nous retrouvons le même sarcasme dans C5, A6-9: le Roi octroie également au page la main de sa fille, bien que Gerinaldo ait dû avouer son crime et même tenté de se décharger de toute culpabilité sur la Princesse. Par cet acte le Monarque prétend à la fois humilier sa fille: "pues así merece descender de alcurnia quien olvidándola dió á un plebeyo la flor de sus amores." La robe de burat (*saya*) mentionnée dans A6-8 rappelle celle de laine grossière avec

laquelle, selon une forme de la tradition, Emma, bannie, s'enfuit dans l'Odenwald. M. Pidal (p. 285) a signalé fort bien l'enchaînement d'idées qui a été cause que, dans la version A8, on souda avec la romance de Gerineldo une autre, qui par le fond égale celles du Conde Sol. La tradition rattachée à la version A9, bien qu'étant la même par son origine, a pourtant subi de notables modifications; la conclusion ne laisse pas que de paraître un peu obscure.

Dans le récit latin, la rencontre entre le Roi et le chambellan n'est pas fortuite (resp. amenée par le Roi) comme dans la plupart des romances; l'initiative y est toute du côté d'Eginhard, qui va implorer le pardon de Charlemagne (comme dans A8, C8, 9). . . . "tandem inter angustias reperto consilio imperatorem aggreditur, flexis genibus missionem postulans"; l'autocrate dissimule et se tait.

Pour le reste, à distinguer deux groupes; l'un, ne comprenant que C1b et C7, a seul gardé quelque ressemblance avec le prototype latin; l'autre, qui se subdivise encore, a introduit des éléments nouveaux, étrangers à la vieille légende, savoir une dernière intervention de la Princesse et, bien plus important, le motif de la fuite:

9. A4, 5; B2 ont en commun l'intervention soudaine de la Princesse; mais tandis que dans B2 elle se mêle à l'entretien du Roi et d'Arinello et réussit à obtenir le consentement paternel à sa réunion avec le page chéri, le dénouement diffère dans A4 et A5. Ici, les amants profitent d'une absence momentanée du Sultan pour chercher le salut dans la fuite. (Dans C7 la Princesse donne aussi au page le conseil de fuir: mais l'exécution de ce projet est sur-le-champs frustrée par le Roi, ce qui a pour suite l'intervention de l'Infante.)

10. C1b, 89-104; C7, 57 et suiv.: Le Roi convoque un conseil des vassaux ("pois tudo tendes ouvido," C1) pour juger Reginaldo. Tandis que dans C1 le page est condamné à mort, dans C7 les grands ne s'unissent pas pour une telle sentence, de crainte d'irriter l'Infante, héritière du trône. Dans cette version, dont, le Roi, cédant à l'indécision des comtes et au désir impérieux de sa fille, consent à se faire l'auteur du bonheur des amants.

Dans C1b cependant, la conclusion véritable, qui ne devait plus comprendre que peu de vers et ressembler à celle de C7, paraît s'être perdue de bonne heure, et il a fallu recourir à un épisode nouveau pour motiver la non-exécution de l'arrêt de mort et la réunion finale du couple. Ainsi les chanteurs populaires du Ribatéjo en sont venus à rattacher au corps de la romance, par une certaine association d'idées, la *scène du donjon*, avec le *solho* de Reginaldo prisonnier. (Une partie en a aussi passé dans la scène finale de la version C4.) À signaler l'analogie de cet épisode avec les romances du Conde Niño ou Nillo et avec celles de Pedro Menino ou Pequeno. Voir aussi Hardung, p. 109, note 1: "Na lição de A. Garrett (C1b) o final pertence visivelmente ao romance da Enganada (Estacio da Veiga, 'Romo. do Algarve,' p. 129-133)," et Th. Braga, 'C. e R. G.,' iii, p. 171: "O final... parece uma adição do romance hespanhol de Virgílios" (cf. 'C. e R. G.,' i, p. 178-183); à mon avis, bien plus de ressemblance avec la romance catalane:

S'en estava Don Francisco
tancat dins de la presó

(Milá y Fontanals 'Rillo. Cat.,' No. 207: "El poder del canto"). Dans le 'Chronicon Laurehamense' il y a aussi, et bien plus prolixe, le récit du conseil tenu pour juger le coupable. Mais là, c'est l'Empereur qui raconte à l'assemblée ce que, le matin, il a vu de ses propres yeux. Diverses sentences sont proposées par les contes. Charles prononce un long discours, souvent fort peu à propos, où il s'étend sur les vicissitudes de la vie humaine, puis, spécialement, sur le cas d'Eginhard; il conclut en disant qu'il aime mieux marier les délinquents que de rendre le scandale public, "et rei probose honestatis colorem superducam" (Lui aussi parle *Como quem sabe fallar*! cf. C7). "Regis igitur audita sententia fit incomparabile gaudium," donc point de jalousie, comme dans C7a. Eginhard est amené; nouveau discours de l'Empereur, qui finit par lui donner sa fille en mariage.

J'ajoute deux mots au sujet des personnages. Charlemagne apparaît dans toutes nos ro-

mances simplement comme "le Roi" (sans nom; A5 le fait Sultans⁸ de Constantinople). A6 connaît aussi la Reine, dont il n'est pas question dans la légende latine. La fille de Charlemagne, Imma, reste fille de roi, sous le nom d'Enilda,⁵⁹ qui, cependant, n'apparaît que dans A4 et 5; seulement dans A5 elle devient sultane, et dans A10 elle est remplacée par dona Maria de Linares. L'amant subit le plus de métamorphoses; et pas seulement pour le nom, qui présente des formes très variées.⁶⁰ D'archichapelain et protonotaire de Charle-

⁵⁸ Il est probable que la première idée de cette dénomination soit venue à l'auteur de A5 de ce que le mot "Sultan" se trouve réellement une fois dans la version A4 (au v. 95, dans la *cuadra* interpolée), circonstance pour laquelle M. Braga veut voir à cette variante "uma côr mourisca da fronteira." Ou serait-ce à cause de la mention faite de la Tatarie (v. 109), où il pourrait y avoir une confusion populaire avec la Barbarie, facile à expliquer par l'homophonie approximative des noms ?—ou bien, parce qu'il est question d'un baptême aux derniers vers ?—Devra-t-on supposer une "teinte mauresque" (d'autre nature) à la version du Maroc A10?

⁵⁹ Ou, avec l's paragogique, Enildas, comme on est libre de dire Juanita ou Juanitas, Matilde-s Marica-s, Mariquinha-s, Gerineldo-s.—La dérivation du nom ? Probablement de *Ena* pour *Ema*, à l'intention de *Ana*; les deux noms pourraient s'être présentés en même temps à l'imagination populaire. Le suffixe—*ilda* fut emprunté à Matilda (Matilde), Cacilda, Izilda, Deonildes; des noms (d'homme) gothiques (tels que Atanagildo, Hermenegildo) et de nombreux noms topographiques (Nevegilde) favorisaient cette formation.

⁶⁰ À l'origine, Einhart ou Eginhardus, du vx.-ht.—Alld. aganhart=consilio strenuus. Dans la péninsule Hispanique, nous avons à supposer dès l'abord les deux formes Eginardo et Eginaldo (comme Bernardo=Bernaldo); elles se sont permutées dans une série de dérivations, dont la plus grande variété revient au Portugal.

1. D'*Eginardo on fit *Reginaldo, d'où, par métathèse, pgs. Gerinaldo C5 (la désinence de ce nom purement littéraire et inconnu au peuple aura causé qu'il y substitua celui de Leonardo, dans C7, tandis que sa supplantation par Dom Alberto C9 est complètement arbitraire).

2. Deuxième série: pgs. Eginaldo (dans une version du Bétra, v. Garrett, 'Romo.' ii, p. 156)—pgs. Reginaldo C1; cast. Gerineldo A1-9 (d'où *Erineldo; cat. Arinello B2); cat. Girineldo (cf. A10); pgs. Gerinaldo C2 et 6, pgs. Girinaldo C4, pgs. Generaldo (dans l'Alemtejo, selon Garrett). De là, le peuple pouvait facilement en venir à créer un général C8 comme amant de la Princesse, bien que, au point de vue étymologique, cela puisse fort bien n'être qu'un dérivé, plus avancé, de Generaldo (cf. pgs. Bernardo-naldonal): en effet, par son application dans la romance C8, "General" paraît moitié nom propre, moitié appellatif; le m. tre, d'ailleurs, s'oppose à cette forme abrégée.

Le surnom "Pampolino," donné à l'amant dans B2, veut dire probablement "gentil gaillard"; il rappelle "pimpollo," qu'on aime à employer dans ce sens.

magne qu'il est dans le récit latin, il devient chambellan du Roi dans A1 et 3, page dans la majorité des versions, noble Seigneur (Dom Alberto) dans C9, un gentil comte (*lindo conde*) dans C6, général dans C8, *capitã general* et *Conde* dans A10, enfin, dans A5, capitaine des gardes et *secretario efectivo* du Grand Turc, avec le surnom du batailleur (*aguerrido*). Par un drôle de mésentendu, qu'on s'expliquera aisément, A2 a encore créé un *camarero* Pulio, au service spécial de l'Infante.

Je ne voudrais conclure sans avoir au moins signalé les groupes de romances qui, grâce à leurs sujets respectifs, sont inséparables de la famille de Gerineldo et s'y affilient en quelque sorte. Ce sont surtout les romances du Conde (del) Sol; du Conde Claros (D. Cales, Carlos) de Montalbán ou Montealvar, ou Conde de Montes Claros; d'Albaninha ou de Galiarda; de Dona Ausenda ou Enxendria, Urgelia (Princesa Alexendra); de Don Galván; du Conde Niño ou Nillo ou Olinos, Dom Doardos ou Diniz, etc.; de la Peregrina, de l'Enganada; de Pedro Menino ou Pequeno. Une partie de ces romances remonte certainement plus ou moins à la même source que celles de Gerineldo, de laquelle elles représentent des rejetons plus éloignés. Ces différentes familles ont encore poussé entre elles des ramifications compliquées et parfois inextricables. Quelque aride que puisse du reste paraître la précédente énumération, elle aura ce mérite de mieux faire connaître combien sont profondes les racines que la tradition d'Eginhard a jetées dans les populations de l'Espagne.⁶²

61 V. aussi Braga, 'O Povo portuguez,' ii, p. 409: "O cyclo da mulher forte."

62 Voir aussi l'attachante peinture de Pidal, p. x, en bas: "ces poésies sont chantées par la vieille assise près du foyer; par le berger, rentrant à sa chaumière dans les crépuscules du soir; par les filles et les garçons dans les "ruidosas esfoyazas" (pgs. *esfolhadas*), en été, et en hiver "en los nocturnos hilanderos." Cette popularité est aussi attestée par la circonstance qu'encore des *piegos sueltos* récents mentionnent parfois Gerineldo comme le modèle d'un amant ou d'un galant consommé, "la norma y espejo de galanes." Cf. "Pasillo nuevo ejecutado entre tío Curso el enamorado y Pepe el valentín," Carmona, s. a.: "Y el que ronda de sequero—aunque *Gerineldo* sea—lo desprecia la más fea—si no le sienta dinero"—et "Nuevo y curioso romance de... Juan Soldado," Valladolid s. a.: "Iba yo delante dellos—más galán que *Gerineldo*." M. Pidal (pp. 283, 284) cite, dans une romance du seizième siècle, traitant des noces de *Mio Cid*, le passage que voici: "Más galán que *Gerineldo*—baja el Cid famoso al patio."

APPENDICE: LA *tonada*.

Les mélodies des romances de Gerineldo (et du Conde Claros) n'ont, malencontreusement, point encore trouvé d'éditeur.⁶³ Le caractère général n'en diffèrera pas de celui des autres *tonadas* de romances, dont nombre ont été publiées dans diverses collections d'airs nationaux.⁶⁴ Pourtant il serait d'un haut intérêt de connaître la mélodie précisément de ces romances; qu'on entende ce qu'en dit M. Braga, 'C. e R. G.,' iv, p. 4: "Os romances de Gerinaldo tem a particularidade de serem a *mnemónica da musica ou toada dos outros cantares*."⁶⁵ Voilà donc la véritable mélodie modèle du genre romanesque qui va être publiée la dernière! Pour se faire une idée approximative de cette espèce de diction musicale, on pourra à peu près s'en tenir aux observations que T. de C. (dans la *Renaxensa*) présente sur les *cants hebraïchs ó árabes*, puisque toute la musique populaire de la Péninsule remonte à celle des Arabes.⁶⁶ On se rappelle d'ailleurs que la déclamation, pratiquée par les chanteurs de voie, les aveugles et les vieilles, se fait sur un ton moitié récitatif, moitié chantant, mais toujours monotone et sans aucune division prosodique. L'instrument préféré des chanteurs de profession ambulants est la guitarre, celui des villageois la *viola*, tandis que les bergers—très experts et affectionnés au chant, en Portugal—se servent de *flautas* et de *pifaros* taillés de leurs

63 Sauf la musique de la version du Maroc A10, qui nous est inaccessible. Cf. Milá y Fontanals, 'Poes. her.' p. 356, note 2:

"T'envio... lo romans de Girineldo... junt ab la tonada monitona ab que per tradició desdel segle xvi ó xvii l'acompanyan y que no deixa de recordar la mateixa* ab que en certa part del nostre bon terral de Catalunya lo havem sentit entonar per bocas femeninas."

Suivent des indications sur l'accompagnement au luth, habituel au Maroc.

*Ces paroles prouvent qu'il y a des variantes.

64 Par exemple, Pelay Briz, 'Cansons de la Terra,' Barcelona, 1866; Sorcano Fuertes, 'Hist. de la Música Española,' Madrid, 1856; A. A. das Neves e Mello, 'Músicas e Canções populares,' Lisboa, 1872.

65 Ce qui n'empêche pas que cette romance ne soit parfois chantée sur une mélodie étrangère; voir la charmante idylle champêtre que donne M. Pidal, p. ix, où il dit entre autres: "El labriego... la ahijada al hombro, el alma adormida en gratos recuerdos, entona los amores de Gerinaldo y la Infanta al són de 'La bendita Madalena.'"

66 Cf. Hardung, p. vi.

propres mains.⁶⁷—Pour certaines mélodies on trouve des louanges enthousiastes chez Milá y Fontanals, par exemple, "Obs.," p. 92 et pp. 100, 101 note. Pourrait-on compter celles des romances de Gerineldo parmi elles?

HANS OTTO.

Cincinnati.

LEBRIJA

AND THE ROMANCE FUTURE TENSE.

A BRIEF notice would seem appropriate in the closing issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES for this year, to call to mind the discovery in Romance morphology which marks for the scholar in this field an important point in the history of scientific grammar. In 1492 the first Spanish grammar was published at Salamanca by Antonio de Lebrija (or Lebrixa: 1444-1522), who was for a quarter of a century Professor at the University of Salamanca; one of the most learned men of his age, a celebrated reformer of university methods and a restorer of letters in Spain. This grammatical treatise is a rare quarto volume, printed in Gothic letter, consisting of sixty-four folios, without titlepage, pagination or catchwords, with thirty-four lines of print to the full page. The British Museum copy, from which are taken the extracts given below, has a few manuscript notes on the margins. A counterfeit of the Salamanca edi-

⁶⁷ Pour les instruments de musique populaires en général, comparez Th. Braga, 'O Povo. Portuguez,' i, ii, *passim* (voir l'*Indice analytico* à la fin du second volume I), surtout i, p. 403-409.

¹ It is difficult to understand why Blanc, 'Grammatik der Italiänischen Sprache' (Halle, 1844), p. 360, should have adopted the spelling *Nebrija* of this name, unless it was thus used by him at second hand. This form does appear on the titlepage of posthumous Spanish works of Lebrija, but as far as I am able to discover from material before me (cf. 'British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books,' s. v. Antonio, *de Lebrixa, the Elder*) not before 1565 (that is nearly half a century after the author's death) in the famous 'Chronica de los muy altos y esclarecidos reyes Catholicos don Fernando y doña Ysabel de Gloriosa memoria...' Of course in his Latin works we have the Epithet *Nebrissensis* (Nebrissa, in Hispania Bœtica) added to Ælius Antonius, the name by which our author was generally known to scholars of his time. It would seem, therefore, that the Halle Professor in speaking of the origin of the Romance Future, referred at second hand to Lebrija's grammar, otherwise he would have naturally used that spelling of the name given in the work itself, especially as it is the form by which the eminent Spanish savant "qui chassa la barbarie" from his native

tion was published about 1770.² The Author, a second Columbus in the domain of letters, who may have known personally the 'world-finding Genoese,' and a townsman of that other less-noted explorer of American domains, Juan Diaz de Solis, analyses with unerring perception and states clearly and succinctly the constituent elements of the Spanish (Romance) Future and Conditional tenses; namely, they are periphrases composed of the Infinitive of whatever verb used, and the Present and Imperfect tenses respectively of *haber*.

In presenting the text of the original edition, the first treatment of this important subject, it may be of interest to compare the Spanish author's statement with that contained in another quarto volume of ninety folios by the Italian, L. Castelvetro, published nearly three quarters of a century later, under the title 'Quinta Fatta al Ragionamento degli Articoli et de Verbi di Messer Pietro Bembo.' (In Modona, MDLXIII),—which represents the second oldest independent testimony, as far as I know, to the origin of the Romance Future and Conditional forms. For the explanation of the latter, Castelvetro is not sure of his ground; according to his idea, as will be observed, both the old and modern language and one of the Franco-Italic dialects, have contributed material for this capriciously formed grammar category. In the following extracts, I have given the beginning and ending of Lebrija's work, together with the special chapter devoted to the subject here under consideration. For the purpose of comparison with the Spanish text, the Italian text of Castelvetro's treatise follows, arranged according to the folios and headings under which he distributed the material represented in the Spanish.

country, is commonly known to modern scholars. The unusual orthography of Blanc has found frequent repetition in the later treatment of Romance forms; as, for example, in the French translation of Diez' 'Grammatik' (third edition) by Morel-Fatio and G. Paris, vol. ii, p. 109, note 2, in the fifth edition of Diez' 'Grammatik,' p. 490, note 2; in the well-known article by Thielmann on "Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des Romanischen Futurums," *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie*, vol. ii, p. 49.

² Graesse, 'Trésor de livres rares et précieux,' vol. iv, p. 653, S. v. *Nebrissensis*.

fol. 2 r. *** Comiença la gramatica que nueva mente hizo el maestro Antonio de lebrija sobre la lengua castellana.

fol. 67 v. Acabose este tratado de Grāmatica que nueva mente hizo el maestro Antonio de lebrija sobre la lēgua castellana Enel año del salvador de mil & CCCCXCIJ. a XVIIJ de Agosto. Empreſso en la mui noble ciudad de Salamanca.

Capitulo . XJ . Delos circunloquios del verbo.

fol. 40 v.

El futuro dize por rodeo del infinitivo & del presente deste verbo. e. as. diziendo io amare. tu amaras que vale tanto como io e de amar. tu as de amar. En esta manera dize por rodeo el passado no acabado del subjunctivo con el infinitivo & el passado no acabado del indicativo deste verbo. e. as. diziēdo io amaria. io leeria . que vale tanto como io avia de amar . io avia de leer. Y si alguno dixiere que amaré amaria . & leere leeria : no fon dichos por rodeo deste verbo . e. as. ia. ias. preguntaremos le: quando dezimos affi: el virgilio que me difte: leer telo e. & leer telo ia: si tu quieres: o si tu quisieſſes . e. ia. que partes fon dela oracion: es forçado que responda que es verbo.

fol. 54.

Particella Qvarantesima

Hora per la formatione uera di questo tempo é da sapere, che la lingua nostra non ha uoce semplice futura se non tre sole in un uerbo difusato, o non ufato mai, & fono queste. FIA, FIE, o FIA. FIENO o FIANO o FIERO * * * . ma le ha composte del presente del uerbo Hauere, & dello'nfinito del uerbo il cui futuro si richiede, dicendofi Dire ho nella guisa che si dice appresso i Greci λέγειν ἔχω , & appresso i latini Dicere habeo significandofi il futuro λέξω Dicam.

Particella Cinqvantesima terza.

fol. 65.

Adunque Amerei col rimanente delle fue uoci compagne é composto dello'nfinito del fuo uerbo cioè d'Amare, e del Preterito d'Ho piegato in alcuna uoce all'antica, & in alcune altre alla Lombarda, & in alcune alla Toscana moderna, come Hei per Hebbe, Hesti per Hauesti, Hebbe, Hemmo per Hauenmo, Heste per Haueste, Hebbono o Hebbero. Onde riescono Amerei, Amereſti, Amerebbe, Ameremmo, Amereſte, Amerebbono, o Amerebbe-ro.

Appresso AMERIA, e le altre uoci compagne, che non fono piu che tre, o al piu quattro, cioè America prima persona, & America terza del numero del meno, et Ameriano terza del piu, & alcuna uolta Ameriamo prima del piu * * * si compongono dello'nfinito del fuo verbo, pogniamo Amare, & del preterito imperfetto Ibam, Ibat, Ibant, Ibamus. Cioè IA, IA, IANO, IAMO * * * .

A. M. E.

ON THE RELATION OF BEN JON-
SON'S 'Epicæne' to Molière's 'Médecin
malgré lui' and 'Femmes
savantes'.¹

OF the learned critics who have discussed the sources of 'Le Médecin malgré lui' and 'Les femmes savantes,' only a single one asserts a relation between Jonson and Molière. Neither Lotheissen nor Mahrenholtz, to mention only those who are most to be relied upon, are of opinion that Molière should have made use of Jonson's piece. And as to the author who affirms that Molière "took his good" in Jonson, too, I mean Mézières, he has run into an error which escaped the attention of all those who, after him, treated of the sources of the French plays. On page two hundred and six of his work: 'Prédécesseurs et Contemporains de Shakespeare' (1881), Mézières says:

"Dans une scène qui devance une situation analogue des *Précieuses ridicules* et des *Femmes savantes*, il est invité à lire des vers de sa façon, et il débite avec une complaisance affectée le morceau suivant," and so on. "Toute la coterie féminine pousse alors des cris d'enthousiasme; ce sont des exclamations, des soupirs, une violence d'admiration qui ne connaît plus de bornes. On croit entendre déjà Bélise, Armande et Philaminte applaudir Trissotin."

There is no scene of this kind in Jonson's piece. I can't but think that Mézières, when writing this, had in mind the second scene of the second act of the English comedy which has something analogous, and notwithstanding very different, in it. There is Jack Daw, "un Trissotin, doublé de Mascarille," to use Mézières' words, reading verses to Clerimont, Dauphine and Epicæne who are not spare in applauding. But these persons are no "coterie féminine," and their applause is ironically meant. So that one whom I might cite in asserting a relation between the French and English pieces is in no wise an authority to be trusted.

Notwithstanding, I think there are some places in both 'Le Médecin malgré lui' and 'Les femmes savantes' which are so similar to places in the English comedy that a connection between them must be assumed,

¹ For the idea of this topic I am indebted to Professor A. Kissner, Koenigsberg, Prussia.

though Mahrenholtz, on page three hundred and eight of his work, says that an acquaintance with the English language and literature is not to be supposed.

As to the former of Molière's pieces, these are my proofs for saying that the celebrated French author knew, and made use of, Jonson's comedy. 'Whoever has read Jonson's stirring work, remembers that Morose, as Clerimont says (i, 1), "has employed a fellow . . . all over England to harken him out a dumb woman; . . . *her silence is dowry enough*, he says." And, at another place, we hear Morose say to Cutbeard: "I know what thou wouldst say, she's poor, and her friends deceased. She has brought a wealthy dowry in her silence." In the same manner, Molière makes Sganarelle say: "Et qui est ce sot-là qui ne veut pas que sa femme soit muette? Plût à Dieu que ma femme eût cette maladie! Je me garderais bien de la vouloir guérir." We see that both the English and the French author embody the same opinion in one of their personages. Nothing in that scene of Molière's provokes Sganarelle to utter those words; the more reason for thinking that there is no mere coincidence, but a reminiscence.

There is another scene in the 'Médecin malgré lui,' where I should think Molière was influenced by Jonson. Immediately after having become Morose's wife, the so-called 'Silent Woman' disproves being dumb. So fluently do the words pour from her mouth that Morose is quite overwhelmed and dismayed and, there is no doubt about it, though the words are not in the text, wishes in his heart she might again become silent.

Likewise, Lucinde in the French piece, after having been, to her father's grief, for a long time thought dumb, addresses her father in such hasty words suffering of no contradiction, to marry her to her lover, that Géronte who, until then, had employed all possible means to deliver his daughter from her pretended dumbness, conceives the same thought which had, as seen in the preceding lines, united the minds of Morose and Sganarelle; for he exclaims (iii, 6): "Monsieur, je vous prie de la faire redevenir muette."

There are some proofs more which in themselves would, as far as I can judge, not suffice

to show a connection of the 'Médecin malgré lui' with 'Epiccène.' I should, by no means, lay stress on them, if they were the only proof of my thesis; but, added to the other and surer proofs from the same piece and to those from 'Les femmes savantes,' they are of some worth. In 'Epiccène' we see a captain appear as a lawyer, and a barber as a parson; Molière's comedy shows a peasant acting as a physician. To appear a learned personage, it suffices to wear the clothes usually worn by lawyers, parsons and physicians and, besides, to "smatter" Latin, though it be forged; Otter and Cutbeard in Jonson's piece, and Sganarelle in Molière's 'Médecin malgré lui' are in like manner acknowledged by the public surrounding them as thoroughbred learned men. I should think Molière owed that good trait to his English predecessor, just as he borrowed a thought expressed by Martine in the quarrel with her husband beginning the comedy, from a similar one of Captain Otter's wife. The "she-Otter" in the first scene of the fourth act reproaches her dissolute and slandering husband with having raised him out of the dust, and Sganarelle, who is given to his bottle just as the captain is to his cups, is forced to hear from the mouth of his wife: "Devrais-tu être un seul moment sans rendre grâces au ciel de m'avoir pour ta femme, et méritais-tu d'épouser une femme comme moi?" It is true, there is no conformity in the words, but surely there is some in the thought.

II.

In speaking of the relation between pieces such as 'Epiccène' and 'Les femmes savantes,' I know, I may easily incur the danger of assuming agreements where there are mere coincidences. Surely I cannot afford to say that Molière borrowed the subject of his much and justly admired piece from Jonson, though the then woman's mania of being or appearing learned is ridiculed by both comedies. So numerous are the pieces of ancient and modern literatures which are cited by critics as leading a character or a scene to that "mosaic work" of Molière's, that I hesitate very much to utter an opinion. Jonson's learned ladies I should rather style "précieuses

ridicules." By their entirely physical love shown in their most indecent behaviour to Dauphine (first scene of the first act) they differ much from the "femmes savantes" of Molière's piece and resemble more the ladies in Molière's earlier comedy alluded to in the preceding lines. Though Molière's thought of making his learned ladies plan an academy is not due to Jonson (for there existed something of that kind in reality), there is, nevertheless, a great agreement in the manner in which Jonson's and Molière's heroines execute or wish to execute their government over the minds of their fellow-men. The lady members of the college in Jonson's piece are (i, 1) said to "cry down or up what they like or dislike in a brain or a fashion, with most masculine, or rather hermaphroditical manner." That, with some restriction, is just the plan of the ladies in Molière's comedy, who, in the second scene of the third act, declare:

"Nous serons, par nos lois, les juges des ouvrages;
Par nos lois, prose et vers, tout nous sera soumis;
Nul n'aura de l'esprit, hors nous et nos amis.
Nous chercherons partout à trouver à redire,
Et ne verrons que nous qui sachent bien écrire."

I say once more the agreement lies less in the plan itself than in the absolute manner in which the English and French ladies behave. The ladies' language, too, is different from other peoples'. In Jonson's comedy Truewit calls his companions' attention to Mrs. Otter's way of speaking (iii, 1): "but mark her language in the mean-time, I beseech you"; and Sir Dauphine himself tickles her ears by loudly, though indeed ironically, saying: "What an excellent choice phrase this lady expresses in." To prove that Molière's learned ladies do the same, I think I need not add scenes; for it is well known that Philaminte who has the same rôle in the French piece as "the grave and youthful matron" (i, 1 Truewit) Lady Haughty, the president of the college in Jonson's work, goes as far as to turn her servant out doors for not being able to "parler Vaugelas."

In some regard she is like Mrs. Otter; just as the latter "commands all at home" (i, La Foole) and "chastizes her subject," that is her husband, to her heart's content, the former does not, though from another motive, allow hers to contradict her in anything she

wishes or does. Sganarelle, of whom I have spoken above, and Chrysale have each something of Captain Otter in them. Otter is, in the fourth scene of the second act, said by Truewit to rail "on his wife, with certain commonplaces behind her back; and to her face —." In the first scene of the fourth act he says: "I confess, gentlemen, I have a cook, a laundress, a house-drudge, that serves my necessary turns, and goes under that title." He slanders her in the utmost manner until she makes her appearance, and then he is "under correction" of his "good princess." Chrysale is in no wise so mean a character. But he, too, behind his wife's back, affirms himself to be the master of his house, and promises things (as in the case of the old female servant Martine) which, in her presence, he is obliged to revoke. And though he thinks the marriage of his daughter to be his work and imagines his will to be performed at least in this case, it is clearly shown by the last scenes of the piece that the union of Henriette and her lover is not executed, before Philaminte, undeceived of Trissotin's meanness, has given up her resistance. So this lady (not unlike Martine in Molière's other comedy) remains "mistress of her subject" to the last, just as the "she-Otter" in the English work.

There are some more points in which Molière's ladies resemble the English collegiates. The latter whose "actions are governed by crude opinions, without reason or cause (iv, 2)" have at first thought Dauphine "a very pitiful knight" and "a very shark," because they "as they are informed" (by authorities such as Daw and La-Foole, in this case) "believe, judge, praise, condemn, love, hate." But having seen him not to be what he appeared to them, each of them endeavours to gain for herself that knight who is at last believed to be "as fine a gentleman of his inches, as any is about the town." And they do so in a way which renders them most ridiculous; for, to make him come to their respective chambers "one of these mornings early or late in an evening," they slander each other and try to disparage their rivals. Much (though not wholly) the same thing occurs with Molière's learned ladies. They cannot be said, it is true, to "have a natural inclination sway, them generally to

the worst, when they are left to themselves"; their love, I acknowledged before, is purer than that evinced by Lady Haughty and her companions. But Belinde's and Armande's endeavours to gain or to recover Clitandre's affection do not differ much from those of the collegiates; especially Armande's efforts to cut out her own sister, and all her behaviour in this affair might be claimed by those ladies. Dauphine is an agreeable "probationer" for the ladies giving themselves much trouble every day to gain to their college some new member, immediately after they have been undeceived of their idols' intrinsic worth; Clitandre is an acceptable son-in-law to Philaminte, as soon as Trissotin's futility has come to light. The latter, just as his fellow-poet Vadius, displays a quality which Jonson attributes to his "bard." Jack Daw, a "precious mannikin" who thinks Homer "an old, tedious, prolix ass," and swears his own verses "are the best that ever man made," takes every opportunity to read them; for, according to him, "an author must recite his own works" (ii, 2). No sooner has it been declared by Lady Haughty in the second scene of the third act that an epithalamium was a want, than he says: "Yes, madam, I'll make an epithalamium, I promise my mistress; I have begun it already; will your ladyship hear it?" Likewise, the poets playing a part in Molière's piece press eagerly for reciting their own works which each of them thinks unparalleled. Both the comedies exhibit a scene where two "protested" fools congratulate each other on qualities which neither of them, in his heart, attributes to his so-called friend. In the fifth act of *Epicène*, Daw and La-Foole, instigated by Clerimont, extoll one another's merits by which each of them is said to be the prime man in the ladies' affections and direct all their actions. Trissotin and Vadius do not, it is true, praise each other from the same motive (for their talk turns on their poems); nevertheless, I should rather hazard the opinion that that scene reminded one of the mentioned scenes in the English author's comedy.

Lastly, I have to speak of a scene of Molière's work where, in the space of one page, two tests of my thesis are contained; I mean the third

scene of the first act. Not so because Clitandre, with whose reasonable opinions those of the author himself, to be sure, are to be identified, blames the mania of the women of the time to be and appear learned, just as Chrysale does in the seventh scene of the second act, and he agrees with Jonson in that blame in general; for that is, in my opinion, quite natural considering the like subject of the pieces. But Clitandre, in agreement with Jonson, utters a thought which is not a natural consequence of that subject and that is why all this finds a place here. By saying:

"Et j'aime que souvent, aux questions qu'on fait,
Elle sache ignorer les choses qu'elle sait;
De son étude enfin je veux qu'elle se cache;
Et qu'elle ait du savoir sans vouloir qu'on le sache,"

he repeats old Morose's thought who addresses his wife that is to be, in this manner: ". . . . And do you alone so much differ from all them, that what they, with so much circumstance, affect and toil for, to seem learn'd, to seem judicious, to seem sharp and conceited, you can bury in yourself with silence?" And Clitandre's lady-love, in answering his words utterly depreciative of her own mother, gives him counsel which we hear Truewit give his friend Dauphine in *Epicœne* (iv, 1): "and fail not to make the household and servants yours, yea the whole family; and salute them by their names ('t is but light cost, if you can purchase them so) and make her physician your pensioner, and her chief woman." Molière has expressed the same thought in this manner:

"Un amant fait sa cour où s'attache son cœur;
Il veut de tout le monde y gagner la faveur;
Et pour n'avoir personne à sa flamme contraire,
Jusqu'au chien du logis il s'efforce de plaire."

EUGENE LESER.

New York.

*E in TUTTI E TRE, TUTTE E TRE.**

THE latest expression on this subject is found in 'Philologische Abhandlungen Heinrich Schweizer-Sidler, zur Feier des fünfzigjährigen Jubiläums seiner Docententhätigkeit an

*The subject includes *e* in the combination of *tutti*, *tutte* with all numerals from *due* to *novè* inclusive. *Tre* is written throughout merely to prevent any possible confusion in the mind of the reader.

der Zürcher Hochschule': "Tutti e tre," von Heinrich Morf. The first two pages of the article review previous opinions as to this *e*, as follows:

Salviati² thought it was equivalent to a shortened *cioè*,—omnes, id est tres (Diez, 'Gram.,' iii³, 40 note, does not accept this suggestion)—Ascoli³ makes mention of it in speaking of another word: "La voce per *ambo è amanduos*, in notevole accordo coll'*it. amendue*, e deve trattarsi di *amb-ed-due*, cfr. *tutti e tre*." "Auch das wird nicht befriedigen" (Morf); "Als Copula verstanden hätte es keinen Sinn" (Diez)—Blanc⁴ saw in the *e* the plural of the masculine article "welcher bei den alten häufig *e* statt *i* lautete." Its use was extended also to feminine nouns, before which it took the place of the feminine article: *tutte e tre le donne*. Morf says of this view:

"Schon Diez hat Blanc entgegengehalten, dass dann unerklärt bleibt, warum man heute nicht auch *tutti e cavalli* sagt, das selbstverständlich von den ältern Texten, welche überhaupt *e* statt *i* haben, geboten wird. Man wird es unerklärlich finden, dass die Italienische Schriftsprache diese Form des Artikels in der Verbindung von *tutti tutte* mit kardinalien bevorzugt haben, sonst aber der gewöhnlichen Form *i* treu geblieben sein und auf diese Weise einen vorher augenfälligen Parallelismus der konstruktion zerstört haben sollte.—Was aber vollends Blanc's Auffassung unhaltbar macht ist der Umstand dass diejenigen Texte, welche als Pluralform des masc. Artikels *e* bieten, gar nicht *tutti e tre* sondern *tutti a tre* aufweisen."

Having reached a construction in which an *a* occurs, the rest of the article consists of a discussion of this construction, showing that the *a* does not represent the preposition *ad*, but that the original form was *tutta tre*, and a remnant of the Latin neuter. The writer comes near his subject again only when he says *tutta* > *tutte* by analogy to *due*. But the *e* is left altogether unnoticed. Ascoli's explanation "wird nicht befriedigen," Blanc's is "unhaltbar," but nothing else is suggested. Does *tutta tre* have any bearing on the question of *e* in *tutti e tre*? Evidently not, for

¹ "Zürich," 1891, pp. 71-79.

² 'Avvertimenti della lingua sopra il Decamerone' Milano, 1809 Lib. 4, part 4.

³ *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, i, 204.

⁴ 'Grammatik der Italiänischen Sprache.' Halle, 1844.

his first point is that the *a* is joined to *tutt-* (*tutta tre* and not *tutt-a-tre*). "Die gemein-romanische Grundlage ist freilich die Nominalkonstruktion *toti tres*"; from this we derive *tutti tre*, and from *tota *tria*, *tutta tre*, but this in no way explains *e* in *tutti e tre*.

My object is, first, to give sound reasons against supposing this *e* to be another form of the masculine plural article *i*, and, secondly, to prove that it is equivalent to *et*.

Diez founded his objection to its being the article on the assertion that, as it was not used in such a construction as *tutti e cavalli* neither could it be supposed to be the article in *tutti e tre*. That such constructions were usual, the following quotations will show: 'Dodici Conti Morali,'⁵ p. 5, *tutti e frati*; p. 8, *tutti e monaci*; p. 27, *tutti e vostri peccati*; p. 33, *tutti e suoi beni*; p. 81, *tutti e suoi peccati*; p. 100, *tutti e beni*, *tutti e sollazzi*; p. 103, *tutti e folli fatti*; *e tutti e folli detti*; p. 121, *tutti e cristiani*;—'Lamenti storici'⁶ p. 227, *tutti e gran signori*;—'Hecatompila'⁷ p. 23, *tutti e suoi lacci*; 'Burcelo'⁸ *tutti e nostri paesi*.

Neither is Morf's assertion, that the texts (in which *e* is used as masculine plural article) when they come to the construction with *tutti* and a numeral employ *tutti a tre*, borne out by the facts, as the following examples will show: 'Dodici Conti Morali,' (l. c.) *tutti e tre*, and *tutte e tre*; 'Decamerone'⁹ *tutti tre*, *tutti e tre*, *tutti et tre*, *tutti & tre*; 'Zenone da Pistoja'¹⁰ *tutte tre*; 'Morgante Maggiore'¹¹ *tutti a tre*, but also *tutti tre*, *tutti et tre*; 'Burcelo,' (l. c.) *tutti tre*.

Of these texts, all of which use *e* for masculine plural article *i*, in only one (Pulci) does *tutti a tre* occur, and here we find also *tutti et tre*. Morf's assertion is, consequently, no

⁵ "Dodici Conti Morali" d'Anonimo Senese (*Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie*, ix). Bologna, 1862.

⁶ "Lamenti storici dei secoli xiv, xv, et xvi" (*Scelta*, ecc., ccxix). Bologna, 1887.

⁷ 'Hecatompila' de Misser L. B. Alberto. Vineggia, 1534.

⁸ 'Li Soneti del Burcelo Fiorentino.' Vineggia, 1477.

⁹ 'Il Decamerone' di Messer Giov. Boccaccio. Venetia, 1471.

¹⁰ 'La Pietosa Fonte,' da Zenone da Pistoja (*Scelta*, ecc., cxxxvii) Bologna, 1874.

¹¹ 'I Fatti di Carlo-magno, e de suoi Paladani.' Opere dei Morgante. Date in luce per Pulci. Venetia, 1481.

argument against *e* being an equivalent of *i* in *tutti e tre*, but, rather than proving the contrary, the assertion leaves us as free to suppose it is such an equivalent in this construction as in *tutti e cavalli* and the like.

I do not believe that the *e* is another form of *i*, but am not satisfied with the objections against such a supposition given by Diez and Morf, as I have just shown. My objection is based on the three following facts:

First, in no one instance is *tutt'i tre* written. We find *tutt'i miei*, *tutt'i suoi* and *tutt'i* with nouns (as, *tutt'i cavalli*) but never with numerals (*tutt'i tre*). Now if the authors who used *e* as masculine plural article with nouns (*tutti e cavalli*) also used the regular *i* by the side of it (*tutti i cavalli*), so, if in their usage of it with numerals (*tutti e tre*) there was a consciousness that the *e* was the same as *i*, this *i* would certainly occur in some instance; its non-occurrence, then, indicates that there was no such feeling.

Secondly, in no instance does *e* occur as representing the feminine plural article *le*, but this latter form is always written in full (*tutte le donne*, not *tutte e donne*). If then it is granted that *e* is the equivalent of *i* in *tutti e tre*, what can it be in *tutte e tre*? It cannot be either masculine or feminine article. It is impossible to say it is the same as *i* or *le* and illogical to explain it in one construction (*tutti e tre*) and not in the other (*tutte e tre*). It must be the article in both or neither.

Thirdly, in the texts where we find *e* by the side of *i* as the masculine plural article, this *e* is sometimes written with the apostrophe (*e*'=*elli*) [Vid. 'Lettere Senese,'¹² p. 90: *e'suoi fatti*; 'Bindo Bonichi,'¹³ p. 170: *che e'pochi*; 'Zenone da Pistoja,' l. c., p. 55: *e'mie'chiavi*]. But it is never written this way in the combination *tutti e tre* (that is, as *tutti e'tre*). This furnishes another reason for believing that the *e* is not the same as *i* in such a combination.

What remains then? While Ascoli merely hints at the *e* being equivalent to *et*, and assigns no reasons for it, Diez and Morf offer no proof against such being the case. I have

¹² 'Lettere Volgari del secolo xiii scritte da Senesi.' (*Scelta*, ecc. cxvi) Bologna, 1871.

¹³ 'Rime di Bindo Bonichi da Siena.' (*Scelta*, ecc. lxxxii) Bologna, 1867.

shown why it cannot be the masculine plural article, but I do believe that it is *et*, though not necessarily used in the sense of German "und zwar" (which is Morf's, not Ascoli's, interpretation).

The first objection against such a supposition will naturally be that a contradiction is implied in that it is illogical to claim that *e* in *tutti e cavalli* means "the" (*i*), and in *tutti e tre*, "and" (*et*). I assert that there is no contradiction. We have

tutti i cavalli—*tutti e cavalli*
—*tutti e tre*.

We are justified in translating *e* in *tutti e cavalli* as "the" because parallel to it we have the same construction with *i* which could never be translated "and"; but in *tutti e tre* there is no such parallel from (*tutti i tre*) to guide in the rendering, and if the *e* is unsatisfactory as an article in such a connection (as I have shown it to be), there is no analogy between it and *tutti e cavalli* to deter us from seeking its explanation elsewhere.

This explanation I make as follows: One who notices the occurrences of numerals in the older texts cannot fail to mark the fact that, contrary to modern usage, the tendency was to employ the longer form; for example, *venti e nove*, *trenta e due*, *sessanta e tre*, instead of *ventinove*, etc. On account of such usage there was a feeling established that when a smaller numeral followed a greater there should be a kind of copula, or connection, between them. This usage was carried from constructions where the greater factor did not include the less (*venti e tre*) to those where it did do so (*tutti e tre*). Although there is no direct analogy, because *tutti* included the *tre* while *venti* did not, yet when a speaker, accustomed to say *venti e tre* wanted to say "all three," it is easily conceivable that, after beginning with *tutti*, he should introduce an *e* before the *tre*, just as when *venti* is followed by *tre* he had used an *e*. Nor is the want of direct analogy between *venti* and *tutti* an argument against my supposition, for the *e* was used in both cases with reference to the *tre* which followed, and not with regard to *venti* and *tutti* which preceded (and this is proved by the fact that if the speaker wanted

to say *venti uomini* he would have no idea of the introduction of an *e* between *venti* and *uomini*.)

Again, if it is objected that my supposed analogy between *venti e tre* and *tutti e tre* does not hold good, because when we find a larger numeral in connection with *tutti*, as *tutti e cinquanta*, there is no such analogy supposable; as, for instance, with a construction like *sessanta e cinquanta*, I will say that I believe the analogy began with the smaller numerals and was extended to the larger; I am justified in holding such a belief because, among the examples noted in my reading, only one such large numeral occurs, *tutti e cinquanta*:¹⁴ the others being *tutti e due*, *tre*, *quattro*, etc., up to *nove*. Besides, the instance spoken of by Salvati, Blanc, Ascoli, Diez and Morf is always *tutti e due*, or *tre*, which induces one to believe that they considered that the explanation of the phenomenon was to be discovered in a consideration of the small numeral.

Thus, I consider the *e* as a sort of "empitura," a filling-out between *tutti* and *tre*, introduced not in the sense "und zwar," nor from any particular necessity (for *tutti tre* also occurs sometimes), but merely for "leggieria," at a time when a similar *e* was in usage with the numerals. Pointing toward such a conclusion is the way the *e* is printed in the edition of Boccaccio, above referred to, where, by the side of *tutti e tre* and *tutti tre*, we find *tutti et tre* (written thus six times) *tutti & tre* (three times) *tutti & quattro*, *tutti & sette* (once each).

I explain the form *tutti a tre* similarly: the original form was doubtless *tutta tre* (Morf),¹⁵ though the author making the most extensive use of it (Cellini:¹⁶) always writes it *tutt'a tre*. I place the *tutt'a tre* (thus written) as the second stage toward *tutti a tre*. From its

¹⁴ 'Novelle di Giov. Sercambi' (*Scelta*, ecc., cxix) Bologna, 1871, p. 48.

¹⁵ On the same principle of analogy with numerals (as that spoken of above in the use of *e* between *tutti* and *tre*) may we not see in the forms *trenta*, *quaranta*, *cinquanta*, etc., up to *novanta* a parallelism in termination that induced the wide-spread usage of *tutta*, if they did not really constitute the original analogical basis for that form?

¹⁶ 'Opere,' Milano, 1806.

original connection with *tutta* as a neuter, the *a* came to be looked upon as the connecting vowel in place of *e*, and when the full *tutti* was again used, its use as a neuter ending was forgotten entirely, and it was thought of only as this connecting vowel.

L. EMIL MENGÉR.

Johns Hopkins University.

The Nature and Elements of Poetry. By EDMUND CLARENCE STEDMAN. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1892. 8vo, pp. xx, 338.

THIS volume, as the author tells us in his Introduction, includes the series of lectures delivered at the Johns Hopkins University, on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation. The lectures have also been presented, from month to month, in the columns of *The Century Magazine*. The author points with honest pride to the fact that the Turnbull Foundation was "the first endowed lectureship of poetry in the United States; and the second throughout the universities of the English-speaking world." In the discussion before him, the author proposes to treat "of the quality and attributes of poetry itself . . . to present poetry in the concrete . . . its essence and incarnation" even at the risk, as he modestly states, of "threshing old straw." Viewing all poetry as divisible into "creation and self-expression," and wisely avoiding any detailed discussion of "schools and fashions," he deals with the "primal nature" of the poetic art. The treatise is presented in eight distinct chapters or papers as follows: Oracles Old and New; What is Poetry; Creation and Self-Expression; Melancholia; Beauty; Truth; Imagination; The Faculty Divine. Insisting, at the outset, that poetry is a force and not made by any *a priori* rules but by "nature and the foreordaining stars," he attempts, by a careful survey of the history of critical opinion, to reach "a serviceable definition" of the art: Reviewing thus the teachings of Plato, Horace, Goethe, Byron, Mill, Ruskin, Wordsworth, Emerson, Lander, Watts, and others, he gives us as his final word on the subject the following: "Poetry is rhythmical; imaginative language, expressing the invention,

taste, thought, passion and insight of the human soul." More specially and tersely, he speaks of the poet as a "revealer"; of poetry, as an "expression of the beautiful"; of feeling, as "the excitant of genuine poetry"; of poetry, as "ideal expression through words"; as either "impersonal or self-expressive"; as seen, especially, in Hebraic and Hellenic verse. In the paper on Melancholia, special stress is laid upon the "subjective undertone" of such authors as Dante and Milton; upon the romantic movement in modern English and Continental verse, and upon the "major and minor keys of lyric song" as heard in the touch of Mr. Browning and Matthew Arnold, and Swinburne "the most subjective of contemporary poets." While there is "no inevitable relation between disease and genius," the author contends for the presence of that "sublime seriousness" which is often the clearest expression of "the sadness of great souls." Some definite idea of what constitutes beauty in poetry is then sought and the critic takes occasion, once again, as in former writings, to exalt construction above mere ornamentation.

In treating of the relations of beauty and truth, timely caution is given against the tendency to make the didactic obtrusive in verse, as Wordsworth and Thompson did, while full praise is paid to that higher didacticism, the poetry of wisdom, which is so signal-ly seen in the Book of Ecclesiastes, as, also, in Tennyson, Browning and Emerson.

Imagination as "the essential key to expression" is then discussed, and the volume closes with a clear presentation of passion, insight, genius and faith as those high and natural forms in which "The Faculty Divine" manifests itself. Such, in brief, is the drift of the discussion in hand, a discussion in which the accomplished author holds himself closely to his theme and seeks to secure and express tenable views.

Were we bent on finding ground for adverse criticism, we might modestly question the exclusive validity of the definition of poetry as given, in that, on the one hand, it is too comprehensive in its statement of separate factors and, also, not sufficiently definite in its use of the word, rhythmical. The term, metrical,

would possibly better express the differentiation between poetry and prose, or poetry and poetical prose.

It might further be hinted, that the word *Melancholia*, as a synonym for subjectivity, even in the minor strain, is not always a just or happy one, its range being restricted and exceptional in the highest verse. Mr. Arnold's phrase, "intellectual seriousness" or the author's own phrase, "a sublime seriousness" is a better one.

Mr. Stedman's high laudation of Whitman, in this as in other volumes from his pen, is to us somewhat surprising, and yet we must not too stoutly demur, while, here and there, are passages which seem to be incapable of a clear interpretation. We hasten on to words of praise, and note two or three characteristic merits. There is evident, throughout, that independence of judgment which is an essential requisite of successful criticism, despite the fact that it is so rarely found. With all due deference to the history of opinion upon the various authors and questions coming under review, Mr. Stedman courteously insists upon his own views, reached, as they have been, by patient thought and reading, and based upon the accepted canons of literary criticism. Not infrequently he finds himself unable to endorse conclusions which have the sanction of age and high authority, and makes no hesitation in uttering his dissent with reasons therefore.

In fact, had not the author done this, a discussion of the nature of poetry would not have been needed, in that it has been so generally treated by ancient and modern students of letters. Moreover, the author is not ashamed to modify opinions which he himself has formerly held, remembering that it is the duty of the true critic, as of the student of truth, at times, to unlearn what he has learned, or to present antecedent convictions in new form by reason of new evidence. A further excellence apparent in this treatise is that it is a thoroughly intellectual presentation of artistic truth, a philosophic discussion of poetic art. The author assures us, at the outset, that he is to proceed after this higher method, seeking "primal elements," those fundamental facts on which the process of generalization may safely be based. The very title of the treatise demands this. If the plan and purpose are in a sense elementary, the author hastens to

add, "that the simplest laws and constituents are also the most profound and abiding."

This is done, moreover, in anything but that unduly didactic manner which the discussion itself so sharply condemns as applied to the criticism of literature. Copious and pertinent illustration saves the pages from every trace of the prosaic and invests a somewhat difficult subject with genuine interest. This combination of maturity of judgment with delicacy of taste is as rare as it is desirable. Many critics, especially of verse, utterly fail in effecting it, while they only are masters in the art who have the faculty of philosophic and of literary insight, and know how to be critically profound without being dull, and critically æsthetic without being superficial.

This is a feature of all Mr. Stedman's work, by which the art with which he deals is made to appear as a scientific and yet an attractive one, and widely removed from so much of that journalistic criticism of the day which sacrifices fact to preference and seeks, at all hazards, to make literary censorship readable.

We notice, further, and with peculiar interest, the author's earnest plea for poetry, for the inherent excellence and world-wide mission of verse. The volume is, indeed, an outgrowth of the conviction that poetry was losing ground in general esteem and that "under stress of public neglect or distaste, the lovers of any cause or art find their regard for it more unshaken than ever." Even in literature, as he intimates, he finds these counter tendencies, and writes at a time "when poetry is strenuously rivalled by other forms of expression, especially, by pure fiction." He, therefore, takes up his pen in behalf of a failing cause and, in the old chivalric spirit of a loyal knight, contends courageously in its defence. He deals with poetry as "a voice of the future" as well as of the past, and would exalt the principles of these "practical idealists" who still believe in the prophet and the bard.

Hence, the hopefulness of his outlook as he closes his survey. "For one," he says, "I believe that the last age of imaginative production is not past; that poetry is to retain, as of old, its literary import, and from time to time, to prove itself a force in national life." With Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier and Tennyson gone, some of us may fail to see the signs

of continuous poetic life, and yet 'tis well to have our forebodings allayed by the positive convictions of one who has a right to know. The discussion before us is thus as stimulating as it is substantial. It lifts the student of verse to higher levels and wider vision, and may be said to be a sound and serviceable contribution to the special department that it represents.

T. W. HUNT.

Princeton College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OLD ENGLISH *scúrheard*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Since reading Dr. Pearce's note in MOD. LANG. NOTES for November, two or three observations occur to me which it may be worth while to communicate.

1. It is not unlikely that OE. *heard* in compounds should oftener be translated by Pearce's 'terrible,' 'dreadful,' than has usually been the case in the lexicons and glossaries.

2. This is especially worthy to be inquired into in the case of epithets applied to offensive, as distinguished from defensive, weapons.

3. Were this carried out consistently, it might suggest a transfer of several instances of simple *heard* from Grein's first meaning to his second or fourth.

4. In favor of this last suggestion is the commonest meaning of the adv. *hearde* in Grein.

5. The fact that there is a copious poetical vocabulary in Old Norse, often presenting remarkable analogies with that of Old English, should not be forgotten in such discussion. It happens that there is a poetical epithet in O. N., beginning with *skúr*, which may throw light upon our compound. I refer to *skurörðigr*, where *skúr* is in a dative construction, such as would better suit Pearce's sixth or eleventh sense, and not an instrumental construction, such as it required by most of the other explanations. This O. N. adjective, which occurs only once in the Edda, according to Egilsson and Cleasby-Vigfusson, is translated by the former as 'obnitens procellæ, vento,' that is, 'breasting the storm, or wind,'

where it is evident that the case of *skúr* can not be regarded as instrumental.

6. It will be noted that *fýrheard*, which Pearce adduced as a parallel, does not refer to an offensive weapon, but to a portion of the helmet. Of course it is not to be denied that *heard* sometimes has its literal sense in the poetical texts.

7. Will not these considerations enable us to get rid, once for all, of the 'scouring,' 'shower of blows from a hammer,' and perhaps of Dr. Pearce's 'shower' in the sense of 'rain-water'?

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

OLD ENGLISH *scúrheard*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The first four paragraphs of the preceding note seem to admit of no special adverse criticism.

Dr. Cook rests his case, to a great extent, upon the O. N. *skúr-örðigr*, a compound which seems to me hardly pertinent for comparison, because

1. It does not seem to be applied to a weapon, either offensive or defensive; and

2. It seems to me that in *skúr-örðigr*, the dative construction of *skúr* is due primarily to *örðigr* (here=*obnitens*); and that *skúr-örðigr*, therefore, can hardly throw any light upon *scúr-heard*, where the second part of the compound has a meaning very dissimilar to that of the corresponding part of the O. N. word.

In spite of Dr. Cook's sixth and seventh paragraphs, the rejection of the interpretation that I have suggested for *scúr-heard*, leaves *fýrheard* an independent and vexatious problem; but the adoption of my suggestion would clear the latter of all difficulties, for then *scúr-heard* and *fýrheard* would represent two different views of one operation.

I am not sure of the strict correctness of my former statement that no instances could be cited of OE. *scúr*=*rainwater*, for there are several passages where this force seems more or less distinctly implied. There is an instructive apposition in "Daniel," 349-50:

Droþena dréarung
Wearmlíc wolcna scúr

And these other passages are also worthy of consideration:

Déaw and déor scúr

"Daniel," 372.

Scúr sceal on heofenum

Winde geblanden in þás woruld cuman.

"Vers. Gnom. Cott.," 40.

And he ártman mægrægnas [rægnas?] scúran
Droþena gehwælcne.

"Satan," II.

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

BEACON BEEKENES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In reference to Prof. Cameron's explanation of *beekenes* (MOD. LANG. NOTES. for Nov. 1892), I desire to call attention to Murray's 'N. E. D.,' where the meaning "lighthouse" is given under *beacon*, and where, among others, the following quotation is found: "1397 Act 21 Richard III, xviii. §1 Les Beekenes devant le port Moeges." Two remarks seem to be called for. First, *Richard III* is a misprint for *Richard II*. Secondly, Murray evidently quotes the same passage as E. M. in *L'Intermédiaire*. But Murray reads *Moeges illocques*, a difference in reading that is easy of explanation. Does the name *Moeges* occur elsewhere?

The equivalent of our *beacon* occurs in Modern Dutch, also in Modern German, where it is *Bak* or *Bake*. Sanders defines it as follows:

"Merkzeichen, sowohl die das Fahrwasser bezeichnenden Wassertonnen, als auch die für die einsegelnden Schiffe als Wahrzeichen errichteten hölzernen Gebäude am Ufer, und die auf den Thürmen u.s.w. brennenden Blusen,"

etc. Of course, it is *niederdeutsch*.

J. H. OTT.

Northwestern University (Wisc).

ON A PASSAGE IN THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In the OE. Chronicle under date of

1135 is a sentence that seems to have been a puzzle to editors. It reads as follows:

"þa wes tre sona þas landes, for ænric man sone ræuede oþer þe mihte."

At *tre* Thorpe says a new scribe begins. He proposed to read *trege* < OE. *trega* 'affliction, grief' for *tre*, but there is in the MS. no authority for this, and the meaning of *trege* would hardly be strong enough for this place. In the edition of Earle and Plummer just out ('Two of the Saxon Chronicles,' Oxford, 1892) the sentence is printed "*þa westre sona þas landes* etc.," as in the original edition by Earle. The glossary, however, gives no other explanation of this new word *westre* than to say 'obscure word' and cite the passage. Würzner in *Anglia* viii Anz. 21 proposes to read *prc* < OE. *præa* 'misery, trouble,' but *t* for *p* regularly occurs in the last part of the Chronicle only after *d*, or *t*, and then only in the case of the article *þe* so this reading is hardly probable. It may also be said, that in all the above attempts at elucidation *sona* is left unexplained, and yet if this is OE. *sona* 'soon' it commonly appears in this part of the Chronicle as *sone* or *son*, both of which occur.

For this obscure passage let me propose another explanation, for which there seems to be some authority both in the forms of language and in the facts of history. The reading I propose is,

"þa wes treson a þas landes, etc."

In support of this reading, 'there was treason in those lands,' it may be said that *wes* is a common form of OE. *wæs* in the last part of the Chronicle, as often in ME. As for *treson* < Norm. F. *treson*, *treison* it occurs in the OE. Homilies (Morris) I, 279 in the form *tresun*, and *tresun*, *treson* are found in other texts, beside *traison*, *trayson* with the diphthong. For the form *a* for *on*, with the sense of *in*, it may be compared with "*o þe norð*" in the entry for 1131, and "*o þe land*" under 1137. Moreover this *a=on* actually occurs in this same Laud MS. under the year 1087, as well as occasionally in the other Chronicle MSS. It therefore can not be regarded as an impossible form for this text.

The proposed reading also suits the historic-

al facts of the year in question. The trouble breaking out at the close of the reign of Henry I. was due to what an English Chronicler might rightly call treason, since the nobles in Normandy were refusing to acknowledge Stephen as king, and it was owing to this abandonment of a settled government, that the murder and bloodshed so vividly pictured by the Chroniclers was due. In the 'Historia Johannis Prioris Hagustaldensis ecclesiae' occur these words on the death of Henry I:

"Quo mortuo, continuo, emerunt homines scelesti & peccatores, cuncta jura justitiae & pacis dissipantes, & ad direptiones, & caedes, incendia, & alia flagitia hostiliter prouentes."

The 'Historia pia memoriae Ricardi Prioris Hagustaldensis ecclesiae' has words of similar import. In Ordericus Vitalis there is a Latin poem on the death of Henry I, in which these lines occur.

"Tollere quisque cupit jam passim res alienas
Rebus in injustis en quisque relaxat habenas.

Luce patet clara quod eis pax extat amara;
Quam mox spreverunt, ut regem fata tulerunt,
Pro nece patritii fures latantur iniqui;
Praedones avidi discurrunt ad mala prompti,
Jamque putant quod nullus eos herus amodo jure
Arceat."

Finally Florence of Worcester puts the case even more strongly.

"Quo sepulto, et Stephano regnante, necnon multo ante, ubique locorum per Angliam et Normanniam, diruptio pacis foedere, plurimum fit disturbatio. Quisque in alterum caput elevat; quae oritur discordia, in vastando omnia nobilium et ignobilium, alta magna ac diversa subintrat moenia; quisque alium rebus spoliatur, potius impotentem vi opprimit, quaestam super hoc agentem minis territat, neci traditur qui resistat."

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

A RECENT ESTIMATE OF BEN JONSON.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The following paragraph from Vol. I of Fleay's 'Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama,' London, 1891, will perhaps interest those who have perused Professor Schelling's admirable edition of 'Timber.' The extract is from pp. 13-14:

"I cannot pass over in silence one point which has been impressed on me at every step in this long labor—the central importance of Ben Jonson. Fourteen years since, in a conversation with the present Laureate at his Haslemere mansion, he rebuked me for my comparatively low estimate of his illustrious predecessor; and although he has since forgotten me (for what reason I know not), I have not forgotten one word of the many weighty apothegms which he uttered in that two days' converse. I have since then studied Jonson deeply, and I do not exaggerate when I say that, although Shakespeare is the central figure in our dramatic literature, Jonson certainly is the central figure in our dramatic history. In the variety of his work, plays, poems, masks, entertainments, and especially in his *Discoveries* (the full value of which has been appreciated, as far as I know, by no one till Mr. Swinburne . . .); . . . and in his unique knowledge, among dramatists of his time, of the only other dramatic literature of anything like equal importance with our own,—he stands preëminently foremost."

On the date of composition Mr. Fleay has a note (on p. 333): "*Timber*, or *Discoveries*. Not those burned in the 1623 fire. These date 1623-35. See Swinburne's excellent essay on this work, which, fortunately for me, needs no further comment here." What will Mr. Fleay say to Schelling's note on p. 4, l. 15?

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

BRIEF MENTION.

The Tenth Annual Convention of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA will be held in Columbian University (15th and H Streets), Washington, D. C., on December 28, 29 and 30. An address on "Recollections of Language Teaching" will be delivered on the evening of the 28th by the President of the Association, Professor FRANCIS A. MARCH of *Lafayette College, Pa.* Papers will be presented as follows: 1. "The Gardner's Daughter; or the Pictures," Professor JOHN PHELPS FRUIT, *Bethel College, Ky.*—2. "The Tales of Uncle Remus traced to the Old World," Professor A. GERBER, *Earlham College, Ind.*—3. "A Grouping of Figures of Speech, based upon the Principle of their Effectiveness," Professor HERBERT E. GREENE, *Wells College, N. Y.*—4. "The Legend of the Holy Grail," Professor GEO. M. HARPER,

Princeton College, N. J.—5. "A Study of the Middle English Poem, 'The Pystal of Susan': its MSS., Dialect, Authorship and Style; introductory to a Collated Text and Glossary," Dr. THOS. P. HARRISON, *Johns Hopkins University, Md.*—6. "The Sources of Udall's 'Roisterdoister,'" Professor GEO. HEMPL, *University of Michigan.*—7. "The Historical Study of English in Virginia," Professor J. B. HENNEMAN, *Hampton Sidney College, Va.*—8. "The Burlesque Ballad in Germany," Dr. C. VON KLENZE, *Cornell University.*—9. "Guernsey: its People and Dialect," Dr. EDW. S. LEWIS, *Princeton College, N. J.*—10. "Manuscript 24310 and other MSS. in the Paris National Library, which contain French metrical versions of the Fables of Walter of England," Professor T. LOGIE, *Williams College, Mass.*—11. "Did King Alfred translate the 'Historia Ecclesiastica'?" Professor J. W. PEARCE, *Tulane University of La.*—12. "Lessing's Religious Development with Special Reference to his Nathan The Wise," Professor SYLVESTER PRIMER, *University of Texas.*—13. "The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English," Professor C. H. ROSS, *Agricul. and Mechan. College, Ala.*—14. "Erasmus' works, especially the 'Encomium Moriae' and the 'Colloquies,' as sources of Rabelais' political, religious and literary Satire," Dr. HERMANN SCHÖNFELD, *Johns Hopkins University, Md.* On the evening of the 29th, a reception will be given the Convention by Professor A. MELVILLE BELL, President of the Phonetic Section.

Macmillan's 'Second Course of French Composition,' by G. Eugène Fasnacht, is based on the excellent principle that a student's attempts at writing a foreign idiom should, at least in the beginning, be limited to the imitation of good models in that language. The way in which this principle is here applied may, however, not meet with the unqualified approval of American critics. In the first place, the 'Composition'—a somewhat over-bulky volume of 430 pages—is made up of three distinct parts, which, apparently, have no connection with one another, and might just as well (or better) have been published separately. In Part I. (pp. 1-131) we find a set of well-chosen French texts, exhibiting many

varieties of style, and, face to face with each bit of French, an English passage of similar character. The only serious fault to be found with these pages is that the English selections are, as a general thing, not closely enough related to the French, so that the author has to give much assistance in foot-notes, and the pupil cannot always employ the imitative method. Part II. (pp. 133-194) consists of English texts without any corresponding French. While most of the pieces offered are good examples of English style, they are nearly all so difficult and idiomatic that an undue portion of the work falls to the share of the annotator. Part III. (pp. 195-416) contains nothing but a long series of French extracts, chosen to illustrate the treatment of many different kinds of subjects; it is, in fact, a French reader. In spite of the literary taste displayed in the arrangement of this part, we fear that few American teachers will find a use for it: readers of this sort are rapidly going out of fashion. In our opinion these models should have been either omitted from the present work, or else accompanied by appropriate English exercises. As a whole, this 'Course' shows originality, a scholarly spirit, and careful workmanship; and although, as we have pointed out, the plan of the work is open to criticism, we regard the book as far superior to most "French Compositions."

A recent addition to the *Modern Language Series* of D. C. Heath & Co. is Victor Hugo's 'La Chute' (from 'Les Misérables,' Book Second of Part First). It is edited by Professor H. C. O. HUSS of the College of New Jersey. The selection is an admirable one, and must commend itself to teachers as a timely aid to the Study of Hugo. The editor's comment in his preface is very just:

"This extract . . . stands by itself as an independent and well-rounded whole . . . It is unusually interesting reading . . . It is strikingly characteristic of Victor Hugo's thought and style, and therefore highly instructive as a literary study. It is surprising how much these four-score pages reveal of their author."

A brief introduction, setting forth the object of the novel with the bearing of the episode, and brief notes, commenting only upon the more difficult points, help to render the edition an attractive and valuable one (8vo, pp. 97).

INDEX TO VOLUME VII, 1892.

Alliteration , Hildebrand's Theory of.....	144-146	Christoval Suarez de Figueroa, Some Documents in the Life of—.....	199-205
Anderson, Edward Playfair, Personal.....	191	Cid, La Gesta del—.....	88
Are's Islendingabók.....	63	Clapin, A. C., Novelle di Enrico Castelnovo.....	95
Anglo-Saxonne, L'Inscription—du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix au Trésor de l'Eglise des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles.....	89-90	— Gli amici di collegio.....	95
— The <i>glen</i> , <i>glena</i>	61-62, 125-126	— Edmondo de Amicis.....	95
— " <i>glen(a)</i> , <i>glet(a)</i>	123-125	Clédat, L., Personal.....	191
— Phonology.....	155-156	Cloetta, Wilhelm, Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance. (See F. M. Warren).....	49-51
— An—Reader.....	149-151	Consonants, Indo-European & after—.....	7-10
— Dictionary.....	158-159	Convention, Ninth Annual—of the Mod. Lang. Association of America.....	33-36
— Chronicles from 800-1001.....	179-181	— Tenth Annual—of the Mod. Lang. Association.....	255-256
— Two of the—Chronicles Parallel (787-1001 A.D.).....	179-181	Cook, Albert S., Recent Opinion Concerning the Riddles of the Exeter Book.....	10-11
— <i>scarheard</i>	193-194	— New Texts of the Old English Prayer and Hymns.....	11-12
Balladen und Romanzen.....	23-25, 127-128	— Logeman: L'Inscription Anglo-Saxonne du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix au Trésor de l'Eglise des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles.....	89-90
Bayou, The Etymology of—.....	198-199	— Literary Motive common to Old, Middle, and Modern English.....	134-137
Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, The Old English Version of—.....	51-54	— Old English <i>scarheard</i>	253
Beekenes.....	220-221	— A Recent Estimate of Ben Jonson.....	255
— Beacon, —.....	254	Correction in Miss Soames' Correspondence.....	189
Béowulf.....	128	Cutting, Starr W., Bernhard: Einführung in Goethes Meisterwerke.....	185-186
Béraneck, Jules, Sénèque et Hardy. (See Schmidt-Wartenberg).....	61	Cynewulf's Elene, Kent's—.....	62
Bernhardt, Wilhelm, Einführung in Goethes Meisterwerke.....	185-186	— The—Question from a Metrical Point of View..	97-107
Blau, Max, Szamat'ski: Ulrichs von Hutten Deutsche Schriften.....	176-179	Danish Orthography	189
Biblioteca Italiana.....	95	Davidson, Charles, The Play of the Weavers of Coventry.....	92-96
Bowen, B. L., Introduction to Modern French Lyrics. (See A. G. Cameron).....	25-26	— Concerning English Mystery Plays.....	170-172
— Hugo: 'La Chute'.....	256	Davis, J. F., Anglo-Saxon Chronicles from 800 to 1001. (See Woodworth).....	179-181
Brandt, H. C. G., Thomas: Hermann und Dorothea. — Hewett: Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea.....	78-82	Deering, Waller, Squair: Sardou's 'La Perle Noire,' — Squair: de Maistre's 'Le Voyage autour du Monde'.....	151-152
Brant's, Die Kirchliche Satire und Religiöse Weltanschauung in—'Narrenschiff und Erasmus' 'Narrenlob,' resp. in den Colloquia. 39-46, 69-75, 173-74.....	189	— Personal.....	151-152
Bright, J. W., Collins: The Study of English Literature.....	31	— Deutsches Slang.....	190
— Johnson: English Words: an elementary study of derivations.....	31	Dictionary, A Universal German-English and English-German.....	86-88
— Hall: Béowulf.....	128	— Encyclopædia, English-German and German-English.....	86-88
— An Anglo-Saxon Reader. (See Gummere).....	149-151	— Anglo-Saxon—.....	158-159
— Bosworth-Toller: Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.....	158-159	Dodge, D. K., Danish Orthography.....	189
ten Brink, Bernhard, Obituary.....	191-172	— Jespersen: Studier over Engelske Kasus.....	214-216
Brown, E. M., Anglo-Saxon <i>glen</i> , <i>glena</i>	125-126	— Larson: Ordförrådet i de älsta slänska handskrifterna Lekikaliskt ock Gramatiskt Ordnat.....	219-220
— Anglo-Saxon Phonology.....	155-156	— Personal.....	225
Brown, Wm. Hand, Notes on Morris and Skeat's Specimens of Early English.....	133-134	— Theodor Wisén: Obituary.....	223
Brun, S. J., Personal.....	191	— <i>Dove for dived</i>	30
Buchheim, C. A., Balladen und Romanzen. (See A. G. Cameron).....	23-25, 127-128	Drama, A Note on the History of the French.....	91-92
Cachy (<i>Somme</i>), The Subjunctive Mood in the Patois of—.....	137-138	Dunbar, The Poems of William.....	123
Cameron, A. Guyot, Buchheim: Balladen und Romanzen.....	23-25	E in tutti e tre, tutte e tre	248-251
— Beekenes.....	220-221	Easton, Dr. Morton W., Personal.....	63
— Bowen: Introduction to Modern French Lyrics.....	25-26	D'Eginhard et Emma, La Tradition—dans la poésie romanesca de la péninsule Hispanique.....	225-243
Canadian French, Notes on the—Dialect of Granby.....	12-14	Elene, Kent's Cynewulf's... Three Unique—.....	62
Celani, Enrico, Le Rime di Tullia D'Aragona Cortigiana del Secolo xvi. (See Rennert).....	182-185	Elliott, A. M., Chamberlain: Modern Languages and Classics in America and Europe since 1888.....	159
Chamberlain, A. F., Notes on the Canadian French Dialect of Granby.....	12-14	— 'French Dialogues, A Systematic Introduction to the Grammar and Idiom of Spoken French,' — Lebrija and the Romance Future Tense.....	222
— Modern Languages and Classics in America and Europe since 1880.....	159		243-244
Chaucer, Studies in—.....	82-85		
— Prologue.....	30		
Chick, Chicken, Chickens.....	90-91		
Christlich Meynenden, Faustbuch des—.....	128		

INDEX TO VOLUME VII, 1892.

Emerson, O. F., English Pronunciation. The "Guide to Pronunciation" Again.....	194-196	<i>Glen, giena</i> , The Anglo-Saxon—.....	61-62, 125-126
— On a Passage in the Peterborough Chronicle....	254-255	— <i>glen(a)</i> , <i>glet(a)</i>	123-125
— The New Webster and the "Guide to Pronunciation".....	17-20	Glass Of Time, Peyton's—.....	174-176
— Personal.....	190	Goebel, Julius, Personal.....	191
— Criticism of "Guide to Pronunciation." (See Samuel Porter).....	118-121	Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea.....	78-82
English, New Texts of the Old—Lord's Prayer and Hymns.....	11-12	— Meisterwerke, Einführung in—.....	185-186
— A Literary Motive common—to Old, Middle and Modern—.....	134-137	Gollancz, Israel, Pearl: An English Poem. (See T. P. Harrison).....	186-189
— Streifzüge durch die Mittellenglische Syntax ...	20-22	Golther, Wolfgang, Are's Islendingabók.....	63
— Judaism in Early—.....	27-28	Gothic Language, A Primer of the—.....	181-182
— The Study of—Literature.....	31	Grammar, French—.....	221-222
— Words: an elementary study of derivations....	31	Granby, Notes on the Canadian-French Dialect of—.....	12-14
— Initial <i>kn</i> in—.....	75-76	Grandgent, C. H., Soames: An Introduction to Phonetics.....	46-49, 157-158, 189
— The Old—Version of Bedes Ecclesiastical History of the—People.....	51-54	— Phonetic Section of the Mod. Lang. Association of America.....	92
— Universal German-English and—German Dictionary.....	86-88	— Personal.....	159
— Encyclopædic—German and German-English Dictionary.....	86-88	Grote, Wilhelm, Streifzüge durch die Mittellenglische Syntax. (See Charles Flint McClumpha).....	20-22
— Negro—.....	62	Groth, P., Association of Spelling Reform in Norway.....	95
— Notes on Morris and Skeat's 'Specimens of Early—'.....	133-134	Gruener, G. E., Falkenheim: 'Kuno Fischer und die litterarhistorische Methode.'.....	216-219
— Concerning—Mystery Plays.....	170-172	Guerino il Meschino, Note on a Paris Ms. of—.....	199
— Pearl: A—Poem.....	186-189	Gummere, Francis B., Schipper: The Poems of William Dunbar.....	123
— Pronunciation. The "Guide to Pronunciation" Again.....	194-196	— Bright: An Anglo-Saxon Reader.....	149-151
— Old— <i>ea</i> =Germanic <i>æ</i> , and O. E. shortening before <i>h+cons</i>	197-198	Hale, Jr., Edward E.—Personal.....	223
— Principles of—Etymology.....	206-212	Hall, John Lesslie, Béowulf.....	128
— Ethical Teachings in Old—Literature.....	212-214	Hardy, Sén:que et—.....	61
— Studier over—Kasus.....	214-216	Harrison, James A., Negro-English.....	62
Erasmus', Die Kirchliche Satire und Religiöse Weltanschauung in Brandt's 'Narrenschiff' und — 'Narrentob,' resp. in den Colloquia.....	39-46, 69-75, 173-174	—, Thomas P., Gollancz: Pearl: An English Poem.....	186-189
Erckmann-Chatrian—Madame Thérèse.....	189	Hart, Charles E.,—Hunt: Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature.....	212-214
Etymologies.....	172-173	Hart, James M., Judaism in Early English.....	27-28
— Popular—.....	189	— The Anglo-Saxon <i>glen, giena</i>	61-62
— Die—von Pflegen.....	107-112	Hatfield, James T., Buchheim's Balladen und Romanzen.....	127-128
— of Bayou.....	198-199	Hausknecht, Emil, Hutchels.....	29-30
— Principles of English—.....	206-212	— Schiller Translation.....	30
Exeter Book, Recent Opinion Concerning the Riddles of the—.....	10-11	Heine's Poems, Selections from—.....	54-56
Falkenheim, Hugo, Kuno Fischer und die litterarhistorische Methode. (See Gruener).....	216-219	Hempl, George, The Anglo-Saxon <i>glen(a)</i> , <i>glet(a)</i> . — <i>glen, giena</i>	123-125
Fasnacht, G. Eugène, Masmilian's Second Course of French Composition.....	256	— Initial <i>kn</i> in English.....	126
Fay, Charles E., White: Selections from Heine's Poems.....	54-56	— Old English <i>ea</i> =Germanic <i>æ</i> , and Old English Shortening before <i>h+cons</i>	197-198
Fischer, Kuno, und die Litterarhistorische Methode. Flügel, Dr. Ewald, Personal.....	216-219	Hermann und Dorothea.....	78-82
—, Felix, A Universal German-English and English-German Dictionary. (See H. S. White). ..	86-88	— Notes to—.....	167-170
Freeman, Clarence C., Personal.....	63	Hewett, W. T., Personal.....	159
French, Notes on the Canadian Dialect of Granby. — Introduction to Modern—Lyrics.....	12-14	— Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea. (See Brandt). — Notes to Hermann und Dorothea.....	78-82
— Readings from—History.....	25-26	Hildebrand's Theory of Alliteration.....	167-170
— Note on the History of the—Drama.....	26-27	Hochdörfer, R., Personal.....	144-146
— Fairy Tales.....	91-92	Hohlfeld, A. R., The Play of the Weavers of Coventry.....	190-191
— Introductory—Reader.....	89	— Personal.....	154-155
— <i>i</i> in— <i>lieu</i> =Latin <i>locum</i>	65-69	Hooper, C. Lauron, Trainstead.....	190
— Ueber <i>re</i> und <i>ré</i> in—.....	152-154	Hubbard, F. G., Ruskin and Sharon Turner....	62-63
— Macmillan's Second Course of—Composition....	221-222	Hugh, Victor—'La Chute.'.....	126-127
Friteau, Gustave, Artificial Vowel Rounder.....	256	Hunt, T. W., Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. (See Charles F. Hart).....	256
von der Gabelentz, Georg: Die Sprachwissenschaft. (See Schmidt-Wartenberg).....	116-118	— Stedman: 'The Nature and Elements of Poetry. — Personal.....	212-214
Gammer Gurton's Needle, The Authorship of—.....	161-167	Huss, H. C. O., Genthe: Deutsches Slang.....	251-253
Garner, Samuel, Super: Readings from French History.....	26-27	— Personal.....	95
Genthe, Arnold, Deutsches Slang. (See Huss)....	60-61	Hutchels.....	60-61
Germanic <i>æ</i> , Old English <i>ea</i> =—, and O. E. Shortening before <i>h+cons</i>	197-198	I in French <i>lieu</i> =Latin <i>locum</i>	159
German-English, A Universal—and English-German Dictionary.....	86-88	Indo-European <i>z</i> after Consonants.....	7-10
— Encyclopædia English-German and—Dictionary. — A—Poem of the xvi. century.....	86-88	In Memoriam, A Contested Point in Tennyson's—.....	157
	114-116		
		von Jagemann, H. C. G., <i>Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte</i>	63
		— Kluge's Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.....	63
		— Szant Iski: Faustbuch des Christlich Meynenden.....	128
		<i>Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte</i>	63

INDEX TO VOLUME VII, 1892.

Jenkins, Thomas A., Sohrauer: Ueber <i>re</i> und <i>rd</i> im Französischen.....	152-154	Matzke, John E., Clapin: 'Edmondo, de Amicis,' — Rousselot: La Méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des Transformations inconscientes du Langage.....	95
— Note on a Paris MS. of Guerino il Meschino.....	199	— Koschwitz: La Phonétique expérimentale et la Philologie Franco-Provençales ...	146-149
Jespersen, Otto, Studier over Engelske Kasus. (See D. K. Dodge).....	214-216	Menger, L. Emil, E in tutti e tre, tutte e tre.....	146-149
Jonson's Ben, On the Relation of—'Epicene' to Molière's 'Médecin Malgré lui' and 'Femmes savantes'.....	245-248	Middle English, a Literary Motive common to Old, —, and Modern English.....	248-251
— A Recent Estimate of—.....	255	— Streifzüge durch die Mittelenglische Syntax.....	134-137
Joynes, Edward S., French Fairy Tales.....	128	Miller, Thomas, The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People. (See Pearce).....	20-22
Judaism in Early English.....	190	Mod. Lang. Association of America, Ninth Annual Convention of the—.....	51-54
Juliana, Concerning—.....	27-28	— Phonetic Section of the—.....	33-36
	93	Molière, Les Précieuses Ridicules.....	92
Karsten, Gustaf E., Indo-European π after Consonants.....	7-10	— Misanthrope by Höcher.....	63
— Etymologies.....	172-173	— " " Markheim.....	189
Kent's Cynewulf's Elene.....	62	— 'Médecin Malgré lui' and 'Femmes savantes,' On the Relation of Ben Jonson's 'Epicene' to—.....	190
Kimball, Augusta C., Sand's La Famille der Germandre.....	189	Montaigne's De l'Institution des Enfants.....	245-248
— 'Exercises in French Composition'.....	222	Morris, Notes on—and Skeat's 'Specimens of Early English'.....	189
Kitchen, D. B., "Episodes from le Comte de Monte-Cristo par Alexandre Dumas".....	190	Mott, Lewis F., A Suggestion in Provençal Literature.....	133-134
Kluge's Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.....	63	Muret, Ed., Encyclopædie English-German and German-English Dictionary. (See H. S. White).....	30
<i>kn</i> , Initial—in English.....	75-76	Mystery Plays, Concerning English—.....	86-88
Kürting, Gustav, Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch. (See Todd).....	56-60		170-172
Koschwitz, M., La phonétique expérimentale et la Philologie Franco-Provençale. (See Matzke).....	146-149	Negro-English.....	62
Lang, Henry R., Personal.....	223	Norway, An Association for Spelling Reform in—.....	95
Language, La Méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des Transformations inconscientes du—.....	146-149	Oertel, Hanns, A German Poem of the xvi Century. — Hildebrand's Theory of Alliteration.....	114-116
Larsson, Ludvig—Ord förrådet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna lekaliskt ock gramatiskt ordnat. (See D. K. Dodge).....	219-220	Ohnet, Georges, Le Chant du Cygne.....	144-146
Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch.....	56-60	Old English, a Literary Motive common to—, Middle and Modern.....	189
Latin, <i>i</i> in French <i>lieu</i> — <i>locum</i>	65-69	— The-Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People.....	134-137
Lebrija, and the Romance Future Tense.....	243-244	Ott, J. H., Beacon, Beekenes.....	51-54
Lecomte, Maurice, Bouderie. (See Warren).....	189	Otto, Hans, La Tradition d'Eginhard et Emma dans poésie romanesca de la peninsula Hispanique.....	254
Leser, Engene—On the Relation of Ben Jonson's 'Epicene' to Molière's 'Médecin Malgré lui' et 'Femmes savantes'.....	245-248		225-243
<i>lieu</i> , <i>i</i> in French— <i>Latin locum</i>	65-69	Parls, Gaston, Extraits de la Chanson de Roland. (See E. S. Sheldon).....	77-78
Litterarhistorische Methode, Kuno Fischer und die—.....	216-219	— Further Notes to—. (See Richardson).....	156-157
Literature, A Suggestion in Provençal—.....	30	Pearl: An English Poem.....	186-189
— The Study of English—.....	31	Pearce, J. W., Miller: The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People.....	51-54
— Ethical Teachings in Old English—.....	212-214	— Anglo-Saxon <i>scárheard</i>	193-194
<i>locum</i> , <i>i</i> in French <i>lieu</i> — <i>Latin</i>	65-69	— Old English <i>scárheard</i>	253-254
Lodeman, A., George Sand's Metaphors and Similes.....	1-6	— Concerning Juliana.....	93
Logeman, H., L'Inscription Anglo-Saxonne du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix au Trésor de l'Eglise des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles. (See Albert S. Cook).....	89-90	Peterborough Chronicle, On a Passage in the—.....	254-255
— Personal.....	63	Peyton's Glasse of Time. (See H. E. Shepherd).....	174-176
Logie, T., Ninth Annual Convention of the Mod. Lang. Association of America.....	33-36	Pflegen, Die Etymologie von—.....	107-112
— The Subjunctive Mood in the Patois of Cachy. (Somme).....	137-138	Phoenix, The Happy Land: from the—.....	6-7
Lord's Prayer and Hymns, New Texts of the Old English—.....	11-12	Phonology, Anglo-Saxon.....	155-156
Lougee, Susan C., French Grammar.....	221-222	— An Introduction to Phonetics.....	46-49, 157-158, 189
Lounsbury, Thomas, Studies in Chaucer. (See C. F. McClumpha).....	82-85	— Section of the Mod. Lang. Association of America.....	92
Lyrics, Introduction to Modern French—.....	25-26	— La—Expérimentale et la Philologie Franco-Provençale.....	146-149
McClumpha, Charles Flint, Grote: Streifzüge durch die Mittelenglische Syntax.....	20-22	Plummer, Charles, Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel (787-1001 A.D.). (See Woodworth).....	179-181
— Lounsbury: Studies in Chaucer.....	82-85	Poetry, The Nature and Elements of—.....	251-253
— de Maistre, Xavier, Le Voyage autour de—ma Chambre.....	151-152	Porter, Samuel, Emerson: Criticism of "Guide to Pronunciation".....	118-121
Maldon, The Battle of—.....	138-143	Pronunciation, The New Webster and the Guide to—.....	17-20
Markheim, H. W. Gegg, Molière's Le Misanthrope.....	190	— Criticism of "Guide to—".....	118-121
Mather, Frank Jewett, Jr., A Note on the Soul and Body Legend.....	93	Provençal, A Suggestion in—Literature.....	30
— The Cynewulf Question from a Metrical Point of View.....	97-107	— La Phonétique Expérimentale et la Philologie Franco—.....	146-149
Matzke, John E., <i>i</i> in French <i>lieu</i> — <i>Latin locum</i>	65-69	Purgatorio, A New Exegesis of—xix, 15.....	36-39, 93-95
— Clapin: 'Novelle di Enrico Castelnuovo'.....	95	Racine's 'Esther'.....	189-190
— " 'Gli amici di collegio'.....	95	— Andromaque—.....	189
		<i>re</i> und <i>rd</i> , Ueber—im Französischen.....	152-154

INDEX TO VOLUME VII, 1892.

Renaissance, Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der—	49-51
Rennert, H. A., Restori: La Gesta del Cid	88
— Schröder: Ueber Titus Andronicus	121-123
— Celani: Le Rime di Tulli D'Aragona Cortigiana del Secolo xvi	182-185
— Some Documents in the Life of Christoval Suarez de Figueroa—	199-205
— Personal	223
Restori, Antonio, La Gesta del Cid. (See Rennert)	88
Richardson, E. L., Further Notes to Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland'	156-157
— Personal	223
Riddles of the Exeter Book, Recent Opinion Concerning	10-11
Roland, Extraits de la Chanson de—	77-78
— Further Notes to—	156-157
Rollins, George W.—Erckmann-Chatrian's Madame Therèse	189
Ross, Charles H., The Authorship of Gammer Gurton's Needle	161-167
Rousselot, l'Abbé, La Méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des Transformations inconscientes du Langage	146-149
Ruskin and Sharon Turner	126-127
Russian, The—Verb and its Accents	14-17
Sand , George, Metaphores and Similes	1-6
— La Famille de Germandre	189
Sardou, Victorien, La Perle Noire	151-152
Schelling, Felix E., Ben Johnson	128
— Three Unique Elizabethan Dramas	129-133
Schiller Translation	30
Schmidt-Wartenberg, H., Béraneck: Sènèque et Hardy	61
— von der Gabelentz: Die Sprachwissenschaft	116-118
— Wright: A Primer of the Gothic Language	181-182
Schönfeld, Hermann, Die Kirchliche Satire und Religiöse Weltanschauung in Brant's 'Narrenschiff' und Erasmus' 'Narrenlob,' resp. in den Colloquia	39-46, 69-75, 173-174
Schröder, M. M. Arnold, Über Titus Andronicus. (See Rennert)	121-123
Schuchardt, Hugo, Personal	159
Scott, Fred N., The Russian Verb and its Accent	14-17
Scôtheard, Anglo-Saxon—	193-194
— Old English	253-254
Sènèque et Hardy	61
Shall and Will, and Should and Would	112-114
Sheldon, E. S., Paris: Extraits de la Chanson de Roland	77-78
— Skeat: 'Principles of English Etymology'	206-212
Shepherd, Henry F., A Contested Point in the Interpretation of Tennyson's 'In Memoriam'	157
— Peyton's Glasse of Time	174-176
Sims, Wm. Rice, The Happy Land: from the Phoenix	6-7
— The Battle of Maldon	138-143
Skeat's Specimens of Early English, Notes on Morris and—	133-134
— 'Principles of English Etymology.' (See Sheldon)	206-212
Slang, Deutsches	60-61
Smith, Annie T.—French Grammar—	222
Soames, Laura, An Introduction to Phonetics. (See C. H. Grandgent)	46-49, 157-158, 189
Sohrauer, Max, Über <i>re</i> und <i>re</i> im Französischen. (See T. A. Jenkins)	152-154
Soul and Body Legend, A Note on the—	93
Spencer, Frederic, Personal	159
Speranza, C. L., A New Exegesis of Purgatorio xix, 15	36-39, 93-95
Spiers, I. H. B., Racine's Esther	189-190
Sprachwissenschaft, Die	116-118
Squair, J., Sardou: La Perle Noire. (See Deering)	151-152
— de Maistre: Le Voyage autour de ma Chambre. (See Deering)	151-152
Stedman, Edmund Clarence, 'The Nature and Elements of Poetry.' (See T. W. Hunt)	251-253
Stockley, W. F., "G. T. S."	95
Storm, Johan, 'French Dialogues, A Systematic Introduction to the Grammar and Idiom of Spoken French'	222

Sugar Industry, Notes on Some Words in the—, not in the Century Dictionary	197
Super, Chas. W., Chick, Chicken, Chickens	90-91
Super, O. B., Readings from French History. (See Samuel Garner)	26-27
— Whitney: Introductory French Reader	89
Szamatólski Siegfried, Faustbuch des Christlich Meynenden	128
— Ulrichs von Hutten Deutsche Schriften; (See Blau)	176-179
Talliet , H., Notes on Some Words used in the Sugar Industry, not in the Century Dictionary	197
— The Etymology of Bayou	198-199
Tennyson's "In Memoriam," A Contested Point in—	157
Thomas, Calvin, Hermann und Dorothea. (See Brandt)	78-82
Titus (Über) Andronicus	121-123
Todd, H. A., Reply to C. L. Speranza's Remarks on "A New Exegesis of Purgatorio xix, 15."	39
— Körting: Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch	56-60
Tolman, A. H., Shall and Will, and Should and Would	112-114
— Bernhard ten Brink; Obituary	191-192
Trainstead	62-63
Tullia D'Aragona Cortigiana, Le Rime di	182-185
Turner, Ruskin and Sharon	126-127
Tweedie, W. M., Kent's Cynewulf's, Elene	62
— Popular Etymology	189
U , Indo-European—after Consonants	7-10
Ulrichs von Hutten Deutsche Schriften	176-179
Verb , The Russian—and its Accents	14-17
Voss, Ernst, Personal	191
Vowel-Rounder, An Artificial—	28-29, 127
Wahl , George Maritz, Personal	223
Walte, Hugo, Die Etymologie von Pflegen	107-112
Warren, F. M., Cloetta: Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance	49-51
— Golther: Are's "Islandgáb c.	63
— Fasnacht: Moli' re's Les Precieuses Ridicules	63
— A Note on the History of the French Drama	91-92
— Lecomte: Bouderie	189
— B cher: Molière's Misanthrope	189
— Ohnet: Le Chant du Cygne	189
— de la Br. te: Mon Oncle et mon Curé	189
— Racine: Andromaque	189
— Montaigne: De l'Institution des enfants	189
— Kimball: Sand's La Famille de Germandre	189
— Rollins: Erckmann-Chatrian's Madame Thérèse	189
— Spiers: Racine's Esther	189-190
— Joynes: French Fairy Tales	190
— Kitchen: Dumas' Episodes from the Comte de Monte-cristo	190
— Markheim: Moli' re's Misanthrope	190
— Kimball: 'Exercises in French Composition'	222
Weavers of Coventry, The Play of the—	92-96, 154-155
Webster, The New—and the "Guide to Pronunciation." (See O. F. Emerson)	17-20
Weeks, Raymond, an Artificial Vowel-Rounder	28-29
White, Horatio S., Selections from Heine's Poems. (See C. E. Fay)	54-56
— Fl gel: A Universal German-English and English-German Dictionary	86-88
— Muret: Encyclopædic English-German and German-English Dictionary	86-88
Whitney, Wm. Dwight, Introductory French Reader. (See O. B. Super)	89
Wisén, Theodor, Obituary	223
Wilson, Charles Bundy, <i>Dove</i> for <i>doved</i>	30
Woodworth, R. B., Davis: Anglo-Saxon Chronicles from 800-1001	179-181
— Plummer: Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel (787-1001 A.D.)	179-181
Wörterbuch, Lateinisch-romanisches—	56-60
Wright, Joseph, A Primer of the Gothic Language. (See Schmidt-Wartenberg)	181-182
Zupitza , J., Chaucer Prologue	30

PB Modern language notes
1
M6
v.7

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
